

SECRETARIAL NOTES
FOR THE
ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF DEANS AND ADVISERS OF MEN



Held at
WASHINGTON, D. C.
April 11-12-13, 1929

SECRETARIAL NOTES
FOR THE
ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF DEANS AND ADVISERS OF MEN

HELD AT
WASHINGTON, D. C.
April 11-12-13, 1929

Republican Print
Lawrence, Kansas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MINUTES OF ELEVENTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE	Page
1. First Session:	
a. The Interfraternity Conference—Charles W. Gerstenberg, Secretary	5
b. Hell Week—Dean Clark of Illinois	7
c. Housing of Unorganized Students—Dean Fisher of Purdue	15
2. Second Session:	
a. The University and Financial Obligations of its Students—Dean Park of Ohio State	19
3. Third Session:	
a. Address by President C. H. Marvin of George Washington University	21
b. Deans of Men as An Educational Factor—Dean Culver of Stanford	24
c. A sense of Humor—An Asset for the Dean of Men—Dean-Emeritus Stanley Coulter of Purdue	27
4. Fourth Session:	
a. Measuring Men—Dr. David Allen Robertson	33
b. Cumulative Personnel Record Cards—Dr. Ben D. Wood of Columbia	42
c. Student Loan Funds—Dean Sanders of Ohio Wesleyan	49
5. Fifth Session:	
a. Shifting Standards of Student Conduct—Hon. Ray Lyman Wilbur	50
b. Control of Inter-Collegiate Athletics—Dean Goodnight of Wisconsin	53
c. Student Migration to Athletic Contests—Dean Armstrong of Northwestern	60
d. The Collegiate Myth — Dean Doyle of George Washington University	68
6. Sixth Session:	
a. Student Group Life—Chancellor E. H. Lindley of the University of Kansas	81
b. Discussion	85
c. Paper Submitted by Dean Robert Rienow of University of Iowa	87
d. Reports of Committees	96
 II. APPENDIX	
a. Roster of Those in Attendance	98
b. Summary of Previous Meetings	99
c. Minutes of the Annual Conference	102

**The Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Association of
Deans and Advisers of Men, Meeting as Guests
of the George Washington University,
Washington, D. C.**

April 11, 12, and 13, 1929

FIRST SESSION

The first session assembled at 9:30 A. M., April 11, in the Mayflower Hotel for registration, and at 10 o'clock was called to order by Dean George B. Culver of Stanford University, President of the Association. In the absence of Secretary Frank M. Dawson, V. I. Moore of the University of Texas was appointed Acting Secretary.

After appointment of committees and announcements by Dean H. G. Doyle of George Washington University, the first paper was presented by Charles W. Gerstenberg, Secretary of the Interfraternity Council.

ADDRESS OF MR. GERSTENBERG

The Interfraternity Conference welcomes the opportunity the Association of Deans and Advisers of Men has given it to explain the work the Conference is doing.

The Interfraternity Conference was organized in 1909, and now has sixty senior members and twelve junior members. A conference is held each year on the Friday and Saturday following Thanksgiving Day, at which time papers are read, reports made and debates held on current problems involving national fraternities. At the same time, the Executive Committee, consisting of the officers ex-officio and six members, are elected. The officers include a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, a Secretary, a Treasurer and an Educational Adviser. Each member of the Committee is elected for a term of two years, and three members, therefore, are elected each year.

For the past seven years, four chairmen have been lawyers, one a physician and one a banker. Mr. Clifford Swan, the present chairman, is an engineer.

The Executive Committee holds meetings monthly, with the exception of the months of July and August. At the first meeting after the conference, the chairman names his committees, whose function is, in most cases, to prepare a report to be read at the following conference. Some of the committees, however, handle special matters that arise during the year. The work of some of these committees will indicate what the Conference has done in recent years.

The Law Committee, for example, has prepared a brief on the deductibility of gifts under the Federal income tax law, a brief that was used in a test case prosecuted under the auspices of the committee to a

successful conclusion. Another brief has been prepared on the subject of tax exemption of chapter houses under the property tax laws. The same committee, with a different personnel, is now engaged in studying the question of incorporation, chiefly as it relates to the problem of taxation. It is also preparing a brief on the question of protection of fraternity insignia.

The Committee on Deferred Pleging, headed by the head of a department of one of the New York high schools—a doctor of philosophy—is making an investigation of the available facts on the problem of deferred pledging.

The work of the Scholarship Committee is well known to all Deans. Not only has scholarship been improved, but uniformity in the method of grading has been urged to the end that the fraternities themselves might have some comparative check on their chapters. Had we not had the very sympathetic cooperation of your Association, the work of the Scholarship Committee would not have made as rapid progress as it has been able to make.

The publications of the Conference consist of the annual minutes, which are now being indexed, a book on college fraternities, and a number of pamphlets. The Conference during the present academic year distributed fifteen thousand copies of the essay "Does Business Want Scholars," written by President Gifford of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. A book on chapter house management and chapter house architecture is in process of compilation.

In conjunction with the Conference, a meeting of Undergraduate Interfraternity Councils is held each year, which gives the undergraduate an opportunity to discuss the problems that are common to all college campuses and to gain each from all the experiences that point the way to solution. A very successful debate on the subject of Hell Week was provided by two undergraduates of Ohio Wesleyan at the last conference. The debate was so successful that the Conference hopes to have a number of such discussions by undergraduates at its future meetings.

One of the important problems that the Conference sees on the horizon at present is the relation of alumni to undergraduate chapters and the university. Many alumni have given unstintingly of their time and effort in studying and solving the problems of the college fraternity in its wider aspects. The Conference represents a horizontal organization of all fraternities on all campuses. It is hoped that the alumni may be urged to become interested in a vertical organization of fraternities whereby men of experience representing the several chapters on a given campus will group together to assist fraternities to become integral and responsible part, of the educational process of college life.

We feel that the teaching staff of a college or university are engaged in the work of scholarship, laying the foundation from which men can learn to improve their position in economic society (business and the professions) and to solve the problems that arise in political life. Other problems can be met only by proper leadership developed by the experiences of gregarious living. Fitness to survive in modern society is measured by the ability to cooperate and to lead, rather than by the

ability to overcome and conquer. The fraternity offers a self governing unit that is taught to recognize obedience to authority above and responsibility for leadership below. Theoretical rationalizing cannot point the way to individual happiness; experience alone teaches that objective-mindedness and altruism open the door to spiritual welfare.

The college man may well say in answer to the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" the startling question, "Who is my brother?" The fraternity man does not raise the second question, and takes for granted that an affirmative is the answer of the former.

It is the aim of the Interfraternity Conference, then, to make the four years of college life four glorious years of living that evolve naturally into a full and complete life.

May I say in closing that we are business men and professional men, but we recognize no calling higher than that of the teacher. We are proud and happy to have the opportunity to participate in his beautiful adventures.

The next paper presented was on the subject "Hell Week" and was given by Dean Thomas Arkle Clark of the University of Illinois.

HELL WEEK

The Chairman: I have no doubt there are quite a number of you who would like to discuss Hell Week and I would be glad to have you take part in this discussion.

Dean Woods: The suggestion is being made at American University that we have now reached the time when we ought to approve fraternities and sororities, and I would like to ask these men here if they think our faculty would be justified in setting up certain prerequisites before a social unit would be approved.

Dean Clark: With us at the University of Illinois, the Council of Administration, which is really the executive committee of the university, decides most questions on the recommendation of a committee on student activities composed partially of students and partially of members of the faculties. I would not make too many rules in the university.

Dean Woods:

Many of our students know all about fraternity traditions because some of the students have belonged to fraternities in the high schools here in the District of Columbia.

Dean Heckel: The problem of "Hell Week" was considered at the meetings of the Inter-fraternity Conference in New York last November. It presents a serious problem to fraternity leaders and university administrators. "Hell Week" was abolished at the University of Missouri last year. Of course, I realize that abolitions are not always effective, but we had an opportunity to test the sincerity of the action this fall. One of the best chapters on our campus, and because of that fact an object of jealousy to some of the others, staged an outside stunt which was a traditional one, and which was designed to teach the freshmen a valuable lesson. The Stunt involved acting through an episode on the part of the upperclassmen in which there was the firing

of pistol shots. After the shots were fired, one of the group pretended to be badly wounded. To make it realistic, his face was smeared with blood, and he was tenderly carried to the chapter house, where he was instantly revived, and the moral which was intended for the freshmen was impressed upon their frightened minds. While this performance was not a violation of the letter of the rule, it was a violation of the spirit of it, inasmuch as it brought our fraternity system into unfavorable publicity in the morning news. Since the chapter involved was not popular with some of the others, there was little difficulty in convincing the Pan-Hellenic Council that the chapter should be punished. The Council voted to deprive them of their social privileges for the second semester of this year, thus establishing a valuable precedent.

The abolition of "Hell Week" was accomplished at Missouri partly because of our organization of the Pan-Hellenic Council. This organization is somewhat unusual in that it combines sociability with business. Each chapter takes its turn in serving as host at dinner to the Council members on the nights of meeting. The pleasant gathering around a table before the actual business session, has resulted in the development of a warm friendship among the delegates, and has made possible harmonious action. Besides, there are five faculty members elected each year as advisory members of the Council. These men presented the faculty point of view in the discussion of "Hell Week." No attempt was made to impose faculty opinion upon the students, and the proposition to abolish "Hell Week" was voted down twice before it was finally approved. Now we limit the probationary period to twenty-four hours before initiation, and the mock initiation which occurs at this time is very definitely limited, so that rough features are suppressed and in many cases the mock initiation has become a more or less impressive preliminary to the initiation itself.

I believe that our abolition is really effective. At any rate this is the first year of my five years at Missouri in which I have had no complaints from the faculty on the interference of initiations with the work of the University. One institution has abolished "Hell Week" by an edict from the president. Personally, I prefer not to govern by imposing regulations from above. If we are patient we can usually lead the students to take proper care of their affairs—an educational process in itself—and the result is likely to be the more effective when it comes from the students.

Dean Goodnight: Mr. President, the manufacturers of pat paddles—"fraternity paddles that satisfy"—have recently been circularizing Phi Beta Kappa with their literature.

Dean Armstrong: I have been discussing the whole matter with the students and there is one phase in which I am interested. I would like to get information on it.

What action have you taken relative to paddling at the regular Monday night paddling? I would also like to ask Missouri if the abolition of Hell Week in itself has had any result at all on the Monday night paddling.

Dean Heckel: I think there has been a very definite improvement in the tone of chapter life. A number of chapters have come to realize

the folly of using the paddle as a panacea in discipline. I think most of them now have the attitude that while it is no longer a desirable panacea, it remains a very effective weapon to be held in reserve. They realize that delinquent freshmen do better by being approached from another angle than that of being beaten into a pulp. Altogether we are having a change of spirit.

The Pan-Hellenic Council action did not do away with the use of the paddle within the fraternity house, for it was pointed out that the Council had no right to invade the chapter house or to dictate the management of any house on the campus. But the abolishing of "Hell Week" brought a decidedly wholesome reaction to this whole problem. At first the fellows assumed that their whole fraternity system would go to rack and ruin if "Hell Week" were discontinued. They were like the man who, walking through the coal fields near Scranton one dark night, suddenly felt the earth give away under him, one of those sinkings which frequently occur from the collapse of an old mine. He frantically grabbed, and was lucky enough to catch hold of a rail. He held on for a long time, until he was exhausted and had to let go, so he committed his soul to God and dropped. He dropped two inches. Fraternities now realize that in abolishing "Hell Week" they have dropped two inches. They know that they will get just as much thrill out of their initiation and have much more respect for the organization than under the old system. The whole morale has been pretty generally improved, and I do not foresee a recurrence to the old practices.

Some very definite statements were made which some persons might regard as threats. However, I tried to avoid threatening. The actual administration of the penalty is in the hands of the Dean of Men. When this chapter was found guilty by the Execution Committee of the Pan-Hellenic Council the penalty was imposed by the Dean of Men.

Dean Massey: Just what do you mean by the penalty?

Dean Heckel: The House was to be dark for a semester; no social functions to be held.

Dean Massey: Individual members may attend social functions?

Dean Heckel: Yes. But no social functions of any kind may take place in their own house.

Dean Moore: As a result of the unfortunate death of a student in the course of a fraternity initiation, and because we feel that there are certain phases of fraternity life which are in need of careful supervision, a Faculty Committee was appointed this year at the University of Texas to investigate the entire fraternity situation and to recommend action which would safeguard both the University and the fraternities against certain evils that exist.

This committee did a thorough-going job and its report is now in the hands of the Regents. It deals with "hell week" and mock initiations, with deferred pledging, with fraternity social life and will unquestionably have a marked effect on fraternities in Austin. When final action has been taken with regard to these regulations and when time has shown the value of the changes proposed, I shall be glad to make a

complete report and distribute it to those Deans of Men who are interested.

Dean Massey: I don't want but a minute of your time to tell you how we are trying to eliminate Hell Week at the University of Tennessee. Together with the student body we have done very little legislating. Our president has nothing to do with it. The administrative council, composed of the deans of all the colleges and heads of the two departments do not legislate unless it is brought in by this committee. But one very definite help all of us did get. There is in every group, in every fraternity a small number of dead beats. Dead beats with reference to the payment of their bills in the fraternity houses. Delinquents and dead beats with reference to scholarship. We found by the elimination of this group in the fraternity that a great deal of this trouble is cured. The dead beat with reference to the payment of his bills is also a very low man in scholarship.

Dean Park: Since we have accepted a representative of the Interfraternity Council as a member I think we should express our appreciation of the work of this group of men who have done as much to the body's attitude towards Hell Week as any group. I refer to the Secretary of the National Interfraternity.

Dean Ripley: Mr. Chairman, how many have eliminated Hell Week?

The Chairman: How many have eliminated Hell Week? (Very few present indicated that Hell Week has been completely eliminated in their institutions).

I have never seen a great deal of use in the exercises and the eccentricities of Hell Week. As a young man I used to laugh at some of the antics which the initiate was made to perform, but it was a sort of hollow laugh forced out of me by the fact that what we were doing was supposed to be funny, but I really never did see any particular humor in scaring the life out of a freshman, or in putting him into uncomfortable physical and mental situations. Singeing a man's hair with a blowpipe, drawing imaginary pictures on his bare abdomen with the point of an icicle, or painting legends on his bosom with iodine, (which occasionally resulted in an infection, though of course this was not intended) seemed even in those far-away days to lack many of the essential elements of real humor, nor did such ceremonies in any intelligent way prepare the initiate for the serious ritualistic ceremony of formal initiation.

I have watched with interest the growth of Hell Week at my own institution, and it is from what I have learned through these observations that I have come to some very definite conclusions.

In the early history of fraternities at the University of Illinois, that is in the early nineties, the organizations did not live in chapter houses. Sometimes members had their meals together; occasionally a number of them lodged at the same house, but their general meetings were at weekends in the furnished rooms which each organization maintained in the business district downtown. There was no such thing as "freshman training" in those days. Men were pledged and initiated overnight, so to speak, and never realized what they had missed. There were informalities carried on before and during the formal initiation, but these were

of short duration, and were carried on within doors. Whatever was done, and it is true there was some foolishness, did not occupy in all more than an hour or two of time.

By nineteen hundred our fraternity groups were beginning to live together in houses which they had rented or which they had built for themselves, but even yet the informalities of initiation were simple and brief. So far as I recall, little or nothing which had in it elements of danger was practiced. Perhaps one explanation of this situation lay in the fact that hazing of freshmen, though taboo by the administration, was still generally practiced between sundown and sun up, and fraternity men rather resented any attacks upon their pledges than otherwise, and so for a time the fraternity pledge, in general, got off scott free. It is only during the last twenty years or so since hazing has become a major offense and hazers have been expelled from the University that Hell Week has seemed to gain favor.

I have listened to the arguments favoring such practices until I can easily count them off on my fingers.

1. It gives the freshman an appreciation of his proper place; that is, it humiliates him, humbles him, creates in him a satisfactory inferiority complex, as it were, so that he can adequately appreciate the honor that is being conferred upon him in permitting him to become a member of the organization concerned. One fraternity officer told me that no one was able properly to receive the lessons taught in the formal ritual of his fraternity until he was in a state of mental and physical exhaustion. It must be a wonderful ritual which demands a semi-comatose mind to understand it.

2. It unifies the members of the freshman class and brings them into closer sympathy with each other. I believe it does, but I am not at all sure that this is wholly a good thing to do.

3. The freshmen expect it and would be woefully disappointed if the trials of the rough-house initiation were omitted. Scores of witnesses are brought forward to testify to the fact that the rocky road over which they traveled previous to the formal initiation into their fraternity made the deepest impression upon them of anything connected with the event, and gave them the greatest pleasure—after it was over! You ask such a man what the ritual was all about and ten to one he cannot tell you anything about it. He was so obsessed with the rough stuff that he was not impressed with the serious principles of the ritual.

4. Well, we've always done it. Of course that settles the matter. Whatever is, is right and should be continued to the end of time. It would be fatal to have an original idea on a subject of that sort, and so everyone goes on as before.

5. Other fraternities still do it, and besides we got it hard last year, the sophomores assert, and it looks as if we ought to get a crack at the other fellows. Here it is a case of getting even with someone. It reminds me of an experience I had not long ago with a young fellow who had had his locker in the gymnasium rifled and his pocket book stolen. He was detected going through another man's effects in an attempt to possess himself of the fellow's pocketbook.

"Well," he explained in justification of his conduct, "someone stole

my money, and it seemed to me it was all right for me to get it back from someone. I couldn't afford to lose the money." It was a case of "an eye for an eye" and no matter whose eye it was.

There are other fallacious reasons alleged, but you know them and it is useless for me to go further into detail. The practice is objectionable for various reasons.

In the first place it is silly. Until we put a stop to the practice we could see on the campus at the University fraternity pledges carrying little tin buckets, or trundling baby buggies to class, or wearing trousers one leg of which was green perhaps and the other red. As one passed by a fraternity house he could discover a freshman in the front yard with a hook and line fishing in a tub of water. One of our groups required all the neophytes to crawl on their hands and knees whenever they came upon the chapter domain, and another demands that in similar circumstances the prospective initiate should walk backwards. And this was freshman training calculated to put the freshman into the proper frame of mind, to stimulate his respect and love for the organization of which he was soon to become a member.

I recall an instance which occurred two or three years ago. A young initiate was required "to walk the burning sands," which consisted of skilfully arranged electric wires that gave the victim some pretty severe shocks. In this case the men who devised the apparatus were supposed to have knowledge of electrical procedure, but unfortunately, the insulation was inadequate. The boy's feet were burned so severely that he was in the hospital for weeks. He suffered a lot of pain and inconvenience and came close to failing his college work.

At our institution we have just had a case of shooting. Fortunately, the young man was not killed, but this lucky outcome of the incident cannot be attributed to his intelligence or to the careful planning of those who were initiating him.

I can recall a number of arrests made for marauding and any member of lucky escapes from assaults and shooting. One of our men, two years ago, had his leg broken. "Of course," the fellows explained, "if he had not been a fool and if he had done the things that he was told to do, everything would have turned out all right." In every case of concussion of the brain and contusion of various parts of the body and physical disorder of any sort, the responsibility for whatever unfortunate happening occurs is invariably placed upon the initiate. He should have more sense than to get hurt. The only marvel to me is that we have not had over the country more fatal accidents than we have had.

Hell Week hurts the fraternities. There is nothing that the newspaper correspondent seizes upon with greater avidity than an accident during a fraternity initiation. During the last year we have had our attention called to half a dozen very unpleasant and sometimes fatal accidents which have resulted from circumstances which those in charge of the initiations had not anticipated when they prescribed the routine through which the initiate was to go. Every accident and every fatality is broadcasted and exaggerated and militates against the good name and the reputation of the Greek letter fraternity. I believe it cannot be shown that Hell Week serves any worthy purpose. Every argument

which can be brought forward in justification of it can easily be met and shown to have no reasonable basis.

For many years at the University of Illinois, we attempted, through advice and direction, to inhibit the practices of Hell Week, with the hope of ultimately eliminating it. We got some response to our efforts, but not a very general one. The practice still went on openly or under cover of night.

Three or four years ago, following an accident which came close to being fatal, we passed certain regulations concerning informal initiations, and these regulations each year, previous to the time of initiation, were sent to the presidents of the various fraternities on our campus. I have no doubt that some of the presidents read them. Some went so far as to respect them. In general, however, I am sure that little attention was paid to them. The fellows were more careful; they eliminated most of the foolishness which tended to attract public attention, but the rough stuff went on. Men were still sent out upon foolish and dangerous quests; they were kept from regular study for days, and cut classes to rest up or went to sleep during recitation periods from sheer exhaustion. The university enforced no penalties, so everyone more or less took a chance on getting away with the violations.

The regulations to which I refer are as follows:

1. No requirements may be made of candidates for initiation which will interfere with regular study hours or University duties, or that involve physically or nervously exhausting tasks.
2. No requirements for initiation may take the initiates outside of the chapter house or chapter grounds, or be of such a character as to attract public attention.
3. Rough-house, vulgar, or indecent practices, especially those involving danger to students, are forbidden.

This last semester following a few broken bones and damaged eyes I decided that the time had come to take our regulations seriously. In sending my letter out to the fraternity presidents previous to initiation I asked that the communication be read carefully and that I have some written assurance from those in charge of initiation that our regulations would be respected.

The response which I received was satisfactory excepting in a few cases. Three organizations alleged that a quest which took the initiates some distance from the chapter house was required by their ritual. One organization stated that physical and mental exhaustion was necessary for a proper approach to their ritual. Three organizations knowingly violated our rules and the officers in charge of the initiation and responsible for the violation were dismissed.

This action created a good deal of discussion and some resentment on the part of certain fraternities. What right had the University they asked, to interfere with their private affairs? On the whole, however, the fraternities took the matter sensibly, and saw the reason for it and the justice in it.

Petitions were presented asking for the reinstatement of the men dismissed, and at the end of three weeks the Council of Administration granted these petitions.

In the meantime the whole subject of probation week or Hell Week was taken up with the Interfraternity Council which held various meetings and entered into warm discussion of the subject. A letter was addressed to the Interfraternity Council as follows:

"In view of recent developments and discussions, the Council of Administration desires to express to the Interfraternity Council anew its full agreement with the action of the national Interfraternity Conference that practices ordinarily included under the term "Hell Week" should no longer be a part of fraternity initiations. The Council of Administration, however, does not disapprove a brief probation period of informal initiation, perhaps ordinarily not to exceed three days conducted in accordance with the regulations announced by the Council of Administration. These regulations are as follows:

1. No requirements may be made of candidates for initiation which will interfere with regular study hours or University duties, or that involve physically or nervously exhausting tasks.

2. No requirements for initiation may take the initiates outside of the chapter house or chapter grounds, or be of such a character as to attract public attention.

Where the prescriptions for initiation fixed by the national organization of a fraternity prescribe some form of quest or search outside the chapter house or grounds and the national officers of such fraternities certify this fact to the Secretary of the Council of Administration, permission will be given for the carrying out of such requirement.

It is not the purpose of the Council of Administration to interfere with the nationally prescribed formal initiation of any national social fraternity.

3. Rough-house, vulgar, or indecent practices, especially those involving danger to students, are forbidden.

It is assumed in this discussion that both the Council of Administration and the officers of the chapters concerned will exercise reasonable judgment in the interpretation of these regulations."

In the end the student council voted to approve the regulations of the University, and to abide by them. The vote stood 51 to 4, with 12 not at the meeting.

These regulations were made to apply also to so-called honorary fraternities excepting that in cases where organizations do not live in houses they might obtain permission to hold their initiatory performances at some place they should designate, their program of initiation having previously been approved.

Following the action and the discussions described I mailed a copy of our regulations to officers of every fraternity represented upon our campus. I have heard from the most of them, and in every case with warm commendation and approval of what we have done.

Personally I believe Hell Week is doomed. National fraternity officers are almost universally against it, the public is against it, parents are, college faculties are, and if college administrators will show a little back bone we can wipe it out, and substitute for it, if there must be a substitute, a probation period which will be profitable and even educative.

The next paper was on the subject:

HOUSING OF UNORGANIZED STUDENTS

By Dean M. L. Fisher of Purdue University.

Gentlemen: I am in the position of one seeking for information and help more than one who has anything to contribute. However, we have had some experience at Purdue and it may be of some assistance.

I think it goes without saying that the unorganized student has a right to the same opportunities, same privileges, and same good conditions of living as the organized man. Unless the unorganized student has a room in some of our newer and modern residence homes, he does not have such good conditions as the organized man in a fraternity. It is the duty of the college through its officers to see to it that the student does have good conditions of sanitation, quietness, comfort, and an opportunity to study. He may not be financially able to get all of these conditions. Many students in college are not able to buy for themselves good rooming facilities. The duty, I think, of the dean of men more than any other officer is to see to it that the student does not room under conditions injurious to his health or affecting his moral attitude.

In the institution where I serve, at Purdue University, we have over two thousand unorganized students who are not in fraternities, who do not room with their parents living in the city, or nearby communities, and who must depend upon rooming in private residences. The conditions under which they room are quite variable. Some of these residences furnish splendid accommodations and the student has a very homelike place in which to live; in others the conditions are not so good.

The unorganized student of necessity has rather a lonesome time of it. He is not surrounded by very many of his fellows who have similar interests or who have similar ideals perhaps. He is far away from the counsel of his parents and does not meet anyone in this private residence who will counsel him. Occasionally, he does find a real homelike residence in which to live.

We have found in going about among the rooming places in our inspection work that in a number of cases where the conditions of equipment and living are not particularly good from the standpoint of convenience, the houses is full of students. The students make no complaints about the rooming-housekeeper either. Generally you will find a motherly soul in that house who makes the boys feel at home. She takes the place of their own mothers in such a way that the boys feel satisfied. That is, we have the human element to deal with in the housing or unorganized students. In many cases the student is dissatisfied, not because the equipment is not good nor because the rooms are not kept clean: he is dissatisfied because the atmosphere of the house is not homelike.

We have been giving a good deal of study to the rooming of unorganized students in the past three years, and before that a good deal of time had been given to it by my predecessor. Our equipment of residence halls is small. We have just one residence hall, accommodating 150 students and we have had very little trouble so far. Our experience, however, is rather limited in that respect. The principal difficulty is in connection with those students who have been pledged to fraternities

after they came to the university. They would like to leave the residence hall and move into the fraternity.

Our contract with students who live in the residence hall is to the effect that they are to stay there for the year. Some of them claim not to have understood that condition when they entered the institution; fraternities also said they did not understand it. However, that matter is apparently being easily adjusted. At a conference with fraternity presidents and the manager of the residence hall, an arrangement was agreed to by which, for the period of Probation Week, possibly a month in some cases, there would be an exchange of men from the fraternity house for the men in the residence hall. Some of the fraternities have availed themselves of that privilege, and so far as I have been able to find out, it has worked very satisfactorily.

A little problem arose with which we seem to have been able to cope. Two or three students who felt that by doing some kind of a trick in the residence hall that would not be approved of they would be dismissed and then they could move into the fraternity. That trick did not work, for they were not allowed to move into the fraternity. They were glad to make arrangements whereby they might stay in the hall for the remainder of their time.

There has been for some time a demand upon the part of the rooming-housekeepers that the University should require students who take their rooms to remain for at least a semester, possibly for the year. Every year I have had the question put to me, why does not the University require a contract between the rooming housekeeper and the student, so that the student will be required to stay? A contract does not seem to me to be a satisfactory solution of the problem. I think I can explain what I mean by an incident. Sometime ago, one of the rooming-housekeepers who had a foreign student rooming in the house, complained that the foreign student was showing too much attention to the rooming-housekeeper's little girl, about fourteen. They had fallen in love. This foreign student, one of the orientals, was desperately in love. The parents assured me that the little girl did not return the student's affections. They were anxious to have him moved and sent to another part of town and this was done. A few weeks later the same parents called and said that another student who had said that he would stay the year out wanted to move and they did not want him to do so. He paid his rent and behaved himself. They wanted him to stay. I wondered what would have been the case if both students had been signed up on a contract. I have had a number of such cases like that arise and I arbitrate the situation as best I can.

I may say that during these three years I have had many conferences with students, committees of the Student Council, and representatives of the rooming-house people. The rooming-house people are not organized but I have called them in and discussed various problems with them. By means of these discussions I think we have arrived at a partial solution of our problem. I have a feeling that a contract between rooming-housekeepers and students will not work out like a contract with students in the residence hall. We do not feel that we have a right to

enter into the rooming-house and say to the owner what we can say to the manager of the residence hall.

One angle of the contract proposition brought up by students seems to be a proper claim on their part. Students feel that unless the contract shall have back of it an inspection of the rooms and an established price for those rooms, they will not have much benefit from a contract. They say that unless the rooms are graded and a price set to be charged accordingly, they will not get much protection because under present conditions there is more or less of a uniform charge for practically all kinds of rooms. A good room in a good place gets the same price per month as very poor accommodations. Students insist that they should have some protection from these conditions.

We have tried by means of correspondence and conferences with rooming-house people and students to bring about a good attitude on the part of both parties, and I think we have had some success in that connection. Again you have the human element to deal with, and there are certain human elements coming together in those houses that are not compatible, and the only solution is that they shall be separated. We have tried to put before the rooming-house people what we feel to be the conditions that ought to prevail in rooming-houses, as to equipment, care of the room, sanitary conditions, and so on. We have tried to put before the student what ought to be his attitude as a guest in the room. I believe we have had some success in that respect.

We are expecting to publish a list of rooms that have been approved, and back of that approval will be approval of the price charged for those rooms. These lists will be available for students seeking rooms.

I should say before closing that our University Code has practically no rules relating to the situation we are discussing. About the only regulation in our Code is to the effect that women students shall room only in places approved by the dean of women, and that houses must be provided with proper fire escapes if there is a necessity of it. Indiana laws require that occupants on the third floor or higher must be provided with proper fire escapes. We have very few such houses but there are a few in which the students sleep in the dormitory on the third floor. Practically all of those are equipped with proper fire escapes. Outside of those provisions our University Code does not provide any rules or regulations for dealing with the subject of the unorganized student or the students rooming in houses. That is wide open for the administrative officers to deal with and we find it a perplexing problem.

Dean Goodnight: Mr. Chairman. We provide house mothers with agreement forms for use in renting rooms to students; these forms contain blanks for the signatures of both the landlady and the student. Printed in bold type is the statement that I stand back of the agreement. But I find that housemothers are not very prone to use it. If a housemother asks an incoming student to sign the agreement to keep his room for a full semester, he says, "I don't want to sign an agreement," and the housemother is afraid to require it for fear the student won't take the room. I don't suppose that more than one-third of our men students have signed agreements of this kind.

I stand back of the agreement when it is signed, however, and don't

let the student move when the notion gets into his head. There is no particular trouble in enforcing that. If a landlady attempts to throw the student out I stand back of the agreement. The advantage is in dealing with the two-thirds who do not use the agreement. When house-mothers who do not use the agreement come whining around asking us to make a student keep his room, we ask: "Do you use an agreement? You have the means within your power of having that student sign up. If you won't use that agreement, we won't help you." With the agreement one is protected against those who won't help themselves. There is a note in the agreement to the effect that the dean of men will not be responsible for verbal negotiations with students who have not signed the agreements.

Dean Clark of Illinois: I should like to have your reaction on the apartment situation. We have made no regulations at the university with regard to students' living in apartments. We have had trouble with those students, if not with them at least with their friends, who were finding the apartments a fine place for doing the things which they are not allowed to do in organized houses or fraternity houses.

We have thought at the university that we would make regulations, as I notice Harvard university has done, that students might not live in apartments in which there was no supervision of any sort. I would like to know if any other institution has had the difficulty we have had.

Dean Heckel: Mr. Chairman, we are going to eliminate students from the apartments next year. We are sending a notice to the apartment owners that we will not recognize a contract between the student and the apartment owner and that if the student has rented a room he will be moved out of the apartment house and the owner will have to stand the loss.

Dean Stone: I am very glad we have the housing of unorganized students for our discussion. Our trouble at West Virginia University has been with unmarried students living in unsupervised apartments. On one occasion it became so serious that I discussed with the President the advisability of a rule forbidding unmarried students to room in unsupervised apartments. We concluded that the better plan was the use of persuasion rather than rule. I am not sure that our action was the right action.

I remember that last fall several young men came to my office and asked me to recommend an apartment for them. They were mature students of good character and high scholastic rating. I helped them to find a comfortable apartment and they have in every way justified my action.

Generally, however, I have tried to make students see the wisdom of living in a private home where they will have some one to look after the room and do the many things a thoughtful and sympathetic landlady can do for students.

We have rooming houses for men, for as yet we have no dormitories for men at the University. Each institution has its own conditions. I want to add this, that in our own institution we have had another problem. We have twenty-five fraternities living in houses. That number was not too many for the men to finance a year ago, but it is too many

now. During the past year we had a number of fraternities that were having great difficulty financially. The young men who are not rooming in the fraternity houses are likely to be persuaded by the treasurer or house manager to come into the house and help support it. Should we have a system that is so rigid that young men will not be able to respond or should we consider it our duty to keep them from contracting with landladies so that when they rent a room they rent with the understanding that they may leave to move into fraternity houses? These questions I would like to hear discussed.

I should very much like to get the observations and hear the reactions of others. These are matters that we are confronted with each year. We don't claim that we have fully met the situation. We have at least improved conditions by giving a more personal attention to the cases as they arise.

The session was adjourned at 12:15 and all members of the association were delightfully entertained as luncheon guests by the Theta Delta Chi Fraternity, 1714 Rhode Island Avenue.

SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 1:45. Dean J. A. Park of Ohio State University presented the following paper on "The University and the Financial Obligations of Its Students."

Few problems reaching administrative officers are more vexing than students debts. No one cares to make of his office a collection agency, yet there are always some cases where one feels the necessity of stepping in to see that justice is done.

Speaking on the basis of the experience of a single institution, we regard the work of our Auditor of Student Organizations as the most constructive done on our campus to educate students in the field of personal and organizational financial affairs. As a condition of its recognition as a student activity, every student organization is required to have its accounts audited through this office. Budget-planning and sound financial policy are considered more important than the check-up as to proper handling of funds, though the latter is carefully done. As an example of the value of this service, this year's Junior Prom manager had his tickets checked and money accounted for by 6:30 on the evening of the Prom. Since he had over \$3,000 in ticket sales, it follows that he had the job well organized. Under such a system there is very little chance for "graft" to creep in.

Fraternity and sorority accounts may be audited at the discretion of the organization. This service was offered for the first time this year, and fourteen groups have taken advantage of it. We have arranged this year with the Columbus wholesalers association to compile a credit rating list of the local chapters, and it is our hope through the publication of this list annually to make a high place on it sought after much as high scholastic rating is now desired.

The landlady-roomer dispute is, of course, familiar to most of you. We require no contracts, and I shall be interested in hearing from some of you who use this system as to its advantages and disadvantages. It

is understood that rent is payable in advance, and the landlady who, by reason of "hard-luck" stories, deviates from this rule, has none but herself to blame.

University tuition and incidental fees are payable the day before classes begin and a five dollars per day fine for late payment takes care of delinquents. Fees may be deferred for short periods, or fines removed by this office if found desirable.

For many years, we have had a Faculty Rule which reads as follows: "No student will be allowed credit in his courses at the end of any Quarter until all bills filed against him, and considered valid by the President have been paid."

Under the present administration, this has practically never been enforced, and at a faculty meeting to be held today, it is to come up for repeal. This raises the whole question as to what a modern university's attitude toward student debts shall be. In cases where it is perfectly obvious that fraud was intended, we need no rules to handle the case. If the University is to assume an attitude in loco parentis we must insist that students adjust these matters before receiving their degrees. To my mind, this is not the function of the University. Students are considered by those with whom they do business as perfectly capable of buying and of contracting indebtedness. In this respect, they are treated exactly as any other citizen. Why then should persons to whom students have indebted themselves expect the college or university to act as a collection agency? We are perfectly willing in such cases to act as an intermediary, when requested, but beyond that point, we do not care to go.

The attitude of the student toward his financial obligations is important. The college atmosphere should not be such as would encourage disregarding them, but if his attitude toward this question is not satisfactory before he leaves his home, it is idle to expect the university to reverse it.

This does not, as I see it, prevent our constant endeavor to maintain the highest standards with regard to the financial obligations of students. Our attitude toward delinquents should be patterned somewhat after that of the corporation having within its employ a person who is constantly being visited by collectors. Such a person is apt to find himself out of a job, the reasoning being that if a man cannot handle his own finances properly, he can hardly be expected to do justice to those of the company.

Such problems as fall within the limits of this discussion cannot ordinarily be solved by rules. The dissimilarity of circumstances accompanying them would prevent that. Their solution will require in addition to a careful consideration nothing more than a medium portion of common-sense.

Dean Cloyd: How is the work of the auditor financed?

Dean Park: He charges on a sliding scale for services and half is paid by the University and half by the organizations.

Dean Heckel: How about worthless checks?

Dean Park: They are left to the law. However, the University dis-

misses students guilty of forgery. Our campus police handle the check problem.

Dean Massey: What about worthless checks given to the auditor?

Dean Park: These cases are handled by the auditor.

Dean Ripley: Are fraternities using the auditor?

Dean Park: The number is gradually increasing.

Dean Coulter: How do the campus police handle their cases?

Dean Park: They turn them over to the city.

Dean Heckel: Do they handle drunks?

Dean Park: No.

Dean Ripley: To whom do the police report?

Dean Park: To the superintendent of buildings and grounds.

Assistant Dean Smith: In regard to student accounts, those which include a balance large enough to invest, our Bursar's Office at a charge of one and one half per cent advises about, and arranges investments for sums of \$100 or more.

Dean Goodnight: Does that apply to fraternities?

Assistant Dean Smith: Not to social fraternities?

Dean Brandon: We have an arrangement at Miami to put all surplus of student organizations in one fund which draws interest. All fraternities are required to have their books audited by the college auditor.

Dean Heckel: Does this cause any resentment on the part of the fraternities?

Dean Brandon: None to speak of. The auditor also helps to make out budgets.

Dean Cloyd: Does your auditor at Ohio State help with budgets?

Dean Park: Yes. This is most important.

Dean McConn: At Lehigh we have a joint faculty and student committee on student groups consisting of three faculty members and three students. Each organization presents its budget to this committee, with a representative explaining the details. The same committee audits the organization accounts on the fifteenth of January and the fifteenth of May each year. This has worked very smoothly.

With regard to bad checks we still have trouble. However, we included a lecture in Freshman Week on such matters, the discussion being given by a professor of Business Administration, and this helped materially.

The second session closed at this time for a pilgrimage to Mount Vernon where wreaths were laid on the tomb of Washington. The Reverend A. G. Murray of Washington, D. C. made a short but impressive address on the occasion.

THIRD SESSION

At 6 P. M. the members of the association assembled as guests of George Washington University at a dinner at the Cosmos Club. The after dinner speakers were presented as follows by the Toastmaster, Dean H. G. Doyle:

The Toastmaster: I suppose that we ought to begin our program

with the customary joke which the toastmaster has been getting from his friends and colleagues.

College professors are divided into three classes, pedants, heretics, and amiable morons; and college deans are professors who have seen their best days. As for our college presidents we find that nearly always they are former professors and former deans.

President Marvin will extend the official words of welcome tonight and I am going to try to be a good toastmaster and make my introductions brief. Our first address this evening will be by President Cloyd Heck Marvin of The George Washington University.

(Note: Truth compels us to say that Doyle's foot slipped and he almost introduced Dean Culver instead of President Marvin.)

Mr. Toastmaster, Members of the Dean's Conference:

As you see from Dean Doyle's mistake in introducing the wrong man at the right time he is prone to do uncertain things. I have to check on him all the time. The use of the word "prone" recalls to my mind the story of a negro pastor, who praying for his small congregation raised his voice in supplication and said, "O, Lord, dis heah little congregation of mine am prone to bear false witness; dis heah little congregation of mine am prone to gossip; dis heah little congregation of mine am prone to steal; dis heah little congregation of mine am prone to do things what I ought not to mention in this house of yours, O Lord, do deliver them from the prone." I wish Doyle might be delivered from the prone.

It is my pleasure tonight to welcome you. I see friends here from the Southwest, from the Pacific coast, from the mid-West, from the South and the East. Your President Culver comes from my own Alma Mater. I extend to you, as cordially as I know how, a welcome to this, your city, for everyone of us feels that he is part owner in this city of Washington. This afternoon you took a pilgrimage to Mount Vernon. All of us after having had the experience of visiting that sacred soil, regardless of how many times we have visited it before, come away with just a bit finer feeling about our nation and about the true place the general, the engineer and the president takes in its history. General Washington believed in higher education. It is my pleasure to head the institution that has as its background a certain number of securities that General George Washington put aside for a university in the nation's capital. As an institution it has gone thru a great number of vicissitudes and now has come to the time when we hope it will take its place among other educational institutions in this country in a way that it can be of service to everyone of you.

Our institution now numbers more than 7,500 souls. It has a teaching staff alone of about 400. We are housed in cellars and garrets where we can drive nails in the walls of our laboratories and can put up partitions. Of necessity we must be Yankees, that is, make the tools with which we do our work, but there is something in being a Yankee so far as education is concerned. I sometimes feel that we have too much order in higher education, that things are too much in place. May I ask you to take this message back to your institutions, that The George Wash-

ington University has one aspiration and that is to help such of your students as may come here from time to time.

May I, at this time, call your attention to the reception tomorrow night. We purposely invited you to George Washington (after dark) because we want you to have as good an impression as possible. We will foregather in Corcoran Hall, Room 1 tomorrow evening at nine o'clock and I hope all of you can be with us.

The position of Dean of Men has been defined in many ways. You are here trying to work out other definitions. You are a part of an institution that is with but one exception the oldest organization in modern society. Traditions of universities because of their age are many. We sometimes think of them as continuing from the beginning to this time. Innovations in the interpretation of the traditional methods and the introduction of such new methods as have occurred, are looked upon as fads.

The academic deans in the institutions are more or less bound to the order of things, except for those who are more adventurous having in mind the newer scientific background and are breaking the way for new interpretations, but the Dean of Men is most free to interpret his position in terms of modern university life because he is handling problems dealing with the adaption of student life to the constantly changing social surroundings. His is a task of understanding human beings in their many relationships.

In the very nature of things the Dean of Men's position is a severe one but in proportion that it is severe it is a glorious one, for growing out of the human relationships established there are many compensations. No other single individual, if he be capable, in any institution has the opportunity of understanding and moulding student life as has the Dean who is free to help students in the many and varied problems that come outside of the academic order of things. The very freedom of the office is its danger. I suppose that this is a law of the universe, that our strength may be our weakness. But at this time you have the opportunity of relying upon the developments in the field of psychology to help you interpret human life. This is more true at this particular time than at any other time in the history of universities.

And so it seems to me that with the freedom that is yours and the scientific helps at your command, you will be able to set a standard in administration which will help in a large way to establish and re-establish in youth the confidence necessary to master their problems and to help faculties to understand in a fuller way their place in carrying thru the task of building men. While you have to handle this latter problem in a way that will not encroach upon "favored reserves," you can help by pointing the way to a more rounded understanding of the phase of the curricula in the life lived by the youth that knock at the gates of the college, and being received expect in passing thru the portals to have the best possible approach to life.

You are not dealing in fads and do not allow any administrative plan which may seem best to you to become the important thing in the scheme of the administration of your office. You are dealing in men, helping the student to get hold of life, to find the right environment in

which he can develop himself to his fullest capacity. This is your task and because I believe the challenge that it brings is the real one, I am glad that you are here conferring together that you may know better how to meet the problems that confront you.

The universities today are in a state of flux. Let us forget as far as possible administrative affairs, let us forget ourselves in our work and remember that our task is that of helping men to find themselves, and prepare themselves better to meet the demands for service in modern society. Again, I am glad you are here.

The Toastmaster: The response to the address of welcome and the presidential address, "The Deans of Men as an Educational Factor" by the president of our association, Dean George B. Culver of Stanford University.

Dean Culver: I have contemplated this convention with a great deal of interest and approached its meeting with an ever increasing amount of trepidation. As every one knows we are a timid and an apprehensive people out in California. Our timidity is due largely to our long and ever present struggle with wild Indians, alert real estate men and earthquakes. And just because one Stanford Quaker has been called to Washington and has been wise enough to strengthen his Interior Department with a distinguished Stanford Doctor there is no reason to believe that a Stanford Dean of Men will be able to guide wisely the deliberations of a large variety of other Deans whose interior departments need no strengthening, if one may judge from their individual and collective attack on this excellent meal.

I hope that no one here considers me so presumptuous as to assume that I can tell him anything concerning his own work or how it should be best performed. I would not touch upon this subject if I thought any one of you had such an idea. It was quite apparent, however, from many of the replies which came in response to my circular letter that there was rather a wide spread desire for possible information concerning some of the duties of a Dean of Men.

Speaking very frankly I do not see how any one can define or set forth such duties. It is as impossible as defining the legal and social and parental duties of a father, or the duties of an older brother or a friend. Where fathers have sometimes failed we must try to succeed; where older brothers have been neglectful, or thoughtless or selfish we must be generous, alert and thoughtful; where friends have lasted only while the sun shines we must last throughout the years.

Some fathers are too paternalistic; some deans are very much the other way—fearful lest some generous impulse overcome their judgment. Some fathers are so proud of what they have accomplished for themselves and their sons that they become a bit restless if the world at large does not recognize their work, their excellence as parents and their cleverness in handling their boys. Let us be patient concerning such matters. Our best publicity is in the hearts and lives of those to whom we have been of service. There are very few flaming headlines in such publicity but there is an enormous amount of satisfaction, for one who lives and thinks in terms of life.

Several letters came to me asking for a discussion as to the exact

title our work or office should carry. Personally I do not consider this a matter of very serious importance. As Sorrell Senior often said to his son in the delightful story of "Sorrel and Son," "It isn't the job that is of so much importance as the way we perform it." I believe this is even more true in the matter of titles or names. I suppose that if we knew Stanley Coulter as Dan Cutter he would be just as fine and inspiring and joyful a figure in our lives. I do not know just what damage would be done if we changed Thomas Arkle Clark to some other combination but I have frequently heard him spoken of as Tommy Arkle, the Clark being merely a flourish. I feel quite sure that it would take nothing away from the fine personality and effectiveness and the virility of my friend from Wisconsin if we hailed him with a twelve hour earlier name. It all depends on the man and his work, so that I could not become unduly worried when several Deans seemed to be especially anxious concerning just what title we should have. What does it matter whether we are Dean of Students, Dean of Student Affairs, Student Adviser, Student Counsellor or Dean of Men. The important matter is not one of titles but of work and accomplishment.

I believe that we should try to remember that we represent the human element in education. Sometimes we hear that this element is being squeezed and mechanized out of education. I do not believe this, although there are evidences now and then that it is being somewhat suppressed, unless one shows evidences of very deep brain convolutions. A high I. Q. frequently opens the academic doors but it provides no endowment policies. However, I thoroughly believe that no matter what general scheme of education may be followed there will always be a place and work for those who are interested in its human factors. It is our business to see to it that we do not allow whatever talents or powers we may have, to be wasted on a lot of slide rule data when there is such a pressing need for human contact and human help. The Registrar's office has figures—plenty of them. It should have them. The faculty has the job of teaching particular subjects, but there are many individual educational problems that are not set forth in the Registrar's office and not touched upon in the classroom, problems that are of the utmost importance to the student. If our offices are functioning as they should, there need be no worry concerning the interest or educational value of our work.

It is an easy and somewhat popular gesture to state that the Great War, the Eighteenth Amendment and the automobile together with easy money have upset, demoralized and completely changed all our educational outlook and processes. I do not believe that this is true. They are simply new problems supplanting old ones.

There is still plenty of genuine romance and adventure in education. There is still the call for pioneers. There is still the demand for sacrifice and self denial. There is still the human equation. Gold is not now, however, mined with pick and shovel or the old cradle and sluice box. Even ditches are dug and potatoes are planted and harvested by machinery. A successful agriculturist must know something of chemistry, something of etymology, considerable of power driven

machinery, something of botany and considerable concerning marketing and the problems of finance.

The old system in which a college education gave a man a knowledge of some Latin phrases and "the humanities," as they were called, was a splendid thing for that particular generation. The "humanities" are still very much worth while but it is difficult to keep the moths out of academic gowns unless they are frequently used. What I am leading up to is a statement of the necessity on our part as Deans for a knowledge of the many educational demands on our men, the wide variety of their interests and the complexity of their social lives. There is a great stress and strain on them attacking them on all sides—physical, mental, moral and financial. They need some one at hand, easily accessible, who can take an intelligent and kindly interest in their affairs and in their problems—some one who can stand with them on their high ground or their low ground wherever they may find themselves and walk and talk with them for a little while at least.

Let us not become mere traffic officers halting or moving machines, nor filling station attendants measuring out gas or oil by the gallon or quart or wiping off wind shields, or preachers or moralists. We are consulting engineers in the great science of life.

If we are qualified by education and experience in life, if we are happy and human and are more interested in helping others than in adding to our personal prestige, our lives and work will be much worth while.

Dr. Wilbur tells the story of a prospector he met up in the Klamath River country in Northern California. The old fellow said that he had been hunting gold for thirty years but that twenty of those years had been spent in looking for his burros!

Let us not forget that we are educators; that is our real work. If we have to spend too much time chasing burros something is wrong. The burros need hobbles or better stake ropes. It is easy to wear oneself out chasing after things that have even longer ears than burros. It is a very easy matter to forget the gold entirely and take a certain grim delight in simply chasing down the strays that have wandered away from camp during the night. No man is an educator who finds his chief delight in capture or captives. The great teachers, the great educators as I recall some of them, were not confined to any one subject or any particular classroom schedule. Their methods were very simple. They were individualists who inspired those who needed inspiration; they gave hope to those without hope; they cleared away the mists for those who were confused; they made realities out of possibilities; they spoke the truth at all times. They did not become weary in well doing. They must have been cheerful souls, too. It is not recorded that they gave long and tiresome examinations, or that they were especially anxious as to what people thought of their work.

David Starr Jordan always said that the world steps aside for the man who knows where he is going. I believe that it does more than that. It runs forward to meet him and points the road ahead.

It is a wonderful tribute to our work that although we come in direct contact with so much that is sordid yet there is so much of noble-

ness in the whole body of our young university men that our lives are full of happiness and the joy of those who feel that their labor is not in vain.

No doubt many of you may not agree with what I have said tonight. It does not greatly matter. Life has been very good to me and I want to leave with you if possible the memory of a man who is happy and grateful for the friendships of life and this organization has given me richly of this great prize of friendship.

The Toastmaster: We are now going to hear from the Dean of Men who is the noblest Roman of them all, a man whom I need only introduce as Stanley Coulter.

Dean Coulter: Mr. Toastmaster, President Culver, President Marvin, and Fellow Deans: I presume the most frank advisors anyone can have are his immediate female relatives. Lately my wife said that the subject which had been assigned me was a very difficult one and would need careful preparation. I said I would have ample time since I would have a day and a half here to think over the problems of deans of men, and lo and behold when I arrive I am told that I am to speak tonight. You understand this is due to Doyle's management. He seemed to function admirably on the Mount Vernon Trip. He functions very much the same way with me.

I am very uncertain as to whether or not I will reach my subject before it is time for us to separate. I am inclined to think, however, that I might add to the definition given by Professor Doyle, the definition that a college president was a man whom every student thought was a liar and every professor knew was a liar. Also that he had only two functions, one was to give pain, the other to receive pain.

In the ten or eleven years of existence of this organization, I have seen various deans appear and various deans disappear. I have found the strong-armed dean who was doing things by the might of his right arm and by his blustering voice, disappear. He fades out of the landscape rapidly. We have found the man who plays for the friendship of student, who is "hail fellow well met" with everybody on the campus, rapidly vanishing. The places that knew him know him no more and probably never will because he did not fit. We have seen the fearful deans disappear, those deans who were afraid they would not do right, that they might be criticized, who lose sleep whenever members of the faculty criticize some action or whenever the president in a moment of indigestion reproves them. Whenever I saw a dean of that kind I have been reminded of the two Irishmen or rather of the one that was left.

Two Irishmen who lived in Tipperary were engaging in one of those combats that are so characteristic of the Irish, and in the midst of the fun, Pat was able to land with his club and strike Mike on the back of his head. Mike fell down and, when they examined him, they found Mike was dead. Well, there was nothing to do but arrest Pat and try him. He was arrested and tried and sentenced to the penitentiary for manslaughter. The judge asked him before he pronounced sentence if there was anything he wished to say. In the trial it had developed that Mike had one of those peculiar skulls known as an egg shell skull, where the

least tap would produce a serious breakage. "Yes, your honor, we had a fight and I struck Mike on the head. But, judge, I would like to know why the devil a man with a skull like that lived in Tipperary."

So when I thought of those sensitive deans I felt very much as Pat did about the man who lived in Tipperary. They ought not to have undertaken such a job and their mistake soon found them out. There are all sorts of deans, you can't tell them by their title as the president has indicated. You can't tell them by their functions. I do not believe that any president or board of trustees when they created a dean knew what kind of an animal they were turning loose on the student body.

There are one or two things in a serious way that do occur to me. Dean Culver has suggested one of those things. I think that a good many of us are not thinking in true terms when it comes to our ideas as to the significance of education. I think very few people know what the end product of education ought to be. I think that in the mechanization of our schools, in our being caught up in the great sweep of the material forces that have been released to humanity, we have too often lost sight of the fact that our definitions of education are not altogether adequate.

I happened to be dining with some bankers not very long ago. I am not often invited by bankers except when my account is over-drawn. One of the bankers was very decided in his criticism of certain educational work that was being done in the schools, and he finally said with a crash of his hand upon the table, "Whatever it is it isn't education." Well, as I had been engaged in education for a number of years, I was interested, So I said to him. "What do you expect education to do for your boy, what do you want the schools to do for him?" He said, "I expect the school to teach him how to make a living and pay his debts."

In a little different phraseology education lies in our minds in terms not altogether dissimilar. If education has any function, is it not to train children how to live? Is there not an enormous difference between training in the high art of living and in training them to make a living? If we can lead them into this high art of living is it not very possible that all these other things will come naturally? If we teach them only these lesser things, teach them to become socialized human beings, teach them to be fairly good citizens, teach them to make a living, isn't it possible that they may go through life with their souls shriveled, and their aspirations and ideals losing their alluring and compelling nature?

It seems to me that people and teachers alike ought not to be dissatisfied with what they are getting from the young. We are really underestimating them, we are really not evaluating them properly, either as to their mentality or as to their power of achievement. I think there is no question about it. Those of us who are older, sometimes feel disturbed because the knowledge that the students have when they come to the university is not what we feel it ought to be. We think that when we were their age we knew things of which they have no knowledge at all. Well that is true, but did you ever stop to think that they know things of which we have no knowledge?

I remember I was visiting my grandson, a lad seventeen years old, and I happened to say something about the seven wonders of the world. He said, "I don't know, what are they?" "Why," I said, "when I was your

age I knew what the seven wonders of the world were, and where they were, I am ashamed of you." He looked at me with that pitying affection that youth has for age and he said, "What's a super-heterodyne?" I said, "Fred, I see the point, don't rub it in." Now Fred did not know anything about the seven wonders of the world, but he could build a radio. He knew intimately the interior anatomy of any type of automobile. I could have talked to him, when I was seventeen in language which he at seventeen couldn't understand, but he at seventeen had talked to me in language which I could not understand at seventy. The mere fact that their knowledge is not like ours does not indicate that it is deficient, because they have a tremendous amount of knowledge. We sometimes think our youths are losing interest and because we cannot arouse their interest, think that something must be tremendously wrong with youth. Yet after all, are they particularly different? Somehow, it seems so to those who are old enough to be still thrilled by the miracles of this most marvelous of all ages. When I sit in my room and turn a dial and find that I am getting a concert from New York, and then turn the dial a fraction of an inch and find myself in Philadelphia, San Antonio or Dallas, it thrills me. I feel that I am in an age of unimaginable wonders. It thrills me through and through, but our children never knew any other world. They came into the world of the radio, the automobile, the telephone and the airplane. Why should they be thrilled with it? They try new pathways just as we tried new pathways and new adventures.

Sometimes it seems to me that we as deans of men give to the young who have come under our control or with whom we have been privileged to come in contact, an entirely wrong slant. We have tried to lead them to believe either by word of mouth or by indirection that, after all, the chief thing in life is for a man to achieve.

The chief thing in life is for a man to be. Evidently what the man is is infinitely greater than anything he ever achieves.

The dean of men has a vantage point far superior to that of any other one connected with the faculty. He has the opportunity of dealing with these young men quite apart from the routine of the classroom, quite apart from the green carpet, those free talks, those intimate conversations as man to man, which will show the youth what is the real center of life. I suppose in a vague sort of way we all feel this to be true. We all wish almost agonizingly that our work might secure results which would indicate that we had seen the real heart of the matter and that we had received inspiration which would lead us to help those young men into the life that was their birthright and inheritance. I presume that if we ever hope to do that, you and I are going to have to train them in thinking. You remember that President Wilson at one time said that a university was a place where thinking is discouraged. I am not quite certain that it is too broad a statement. I suppose when you release youth from its four year academic sentence, you expect it to go into the world thinking, rational human beings, thinking straight. I want to know whether we have any right to expect that. The training has not begun soon enough. You can recall homes in which about the only direction given to a child is, "You must do this, you must do that." When

some timid "Why?" is heard the answer comes, "never mind why, do what I tell you." The child is not given an opportunity to choose. Yet the parent expects her child to think.

The power of thinking is not born overnight, it does not spring full-armed from the brow of Jove. It is the result of training.

There was a chap who had an instinct for mathematics. He was what his fellows called a mathematical shark. Whenever problems were presented he saw a shortcut to the solution. There were some very difficult formulas to be solved, and that boy thought he saw a shortcut. He tried it out and it worked. He wasn't satisfied so he went home and tried it out and it worked. He could do it in a tenth of the time, using only one fourth of the paper and with less than one fourth of the formula. So he said to me, "See me knock that man's eye out the next time he gives the examination. He will ask that question and I'll knock his eye out." "Well, that's not safe," I said, "I don't know whether I would advise you to do it." He came to me later on. "We got the problem on the examination," he said. "I bet you I draw ten on that." "Come and tell me what he gives you." The next day he came to me. He was the maddest man I ever saw. "You know what that old stiff did?" I said, "He gave you a zero. When you found it out, what did you say?" "I asked him if the answer was right, if the method was right, and he said, 'yes.' "Was the method shorter? He said, 'yes, the method was shorter.' Wasn't it better? 'Yes, it was a better method.' Then why did you give me a zero? 'Because you did not do it as I told you to'."

If the university was paying him a salary it was for discouraging thinking. Incidentally, I might say that in the revision of a book this teacher issued, he used the boy's solution without any credit to the boy.

There you see the man under-rated the student's mentality. He was immediately willing to say it was a better method but was not the method he gave, which was what he asked for.

My daughter conscientiously wrote out quite a long paper on an entrance examination. When it came back it was endorsed, "Entirely wrong, but shows thought, 95%." That was right, the girl had been thinking and there was a teacher that recognized thought even though the conclusions were wrong and the methods wrong.

But the power of thinking. Have you ever realized that if in some way we could develop the power of thinking in these young men, their problems would be very much simpler, they would be very much more successful in their solution? I have been thinking as to what are the greatest weaknesses that you and I as deans of men show. I can't tell exactly. Some of us, I presume, are weak because of the fact that we do not sense our problem clearly. I think, however, that a good many of us are weak because we are very careful that these young people shall obey to the last letter the laws that we have laid down, and we are not half so insistent that they should come into the rich full life that the university years will bring them, and the university years would bring them if we would throw some of our experiences into their lives in a helpful sort of way. We have failed to realize that a character was never built upon a series of negations. You can't do much for the young but you can do much with them. When we come to these problems that

confront the young and show them in some sort of fashion that after all it is for them to choose, certain advantages here, certain advantages there, here a series of disadvantages, there a disadvantage, it is for you to choose, you will find in most cases they will follow your leading. It seems somewhat wrong, but somehow or other deans of this sort that must take the lead in these matters, remind me a little of the absent-minded dean, an extremely absent-minded dean who had a wife who was quite literary. It so happened that one day the wife presented him with a son. By chance, on that same day the Atlantic Monthly came out with an article written by her. After that, the article loomed most largely in his mind. When the class applauded him on the advent of a son and heir he said, "Gentlemen, I had nothing to do with the matter. It is entirely the work of my wife in collaboration with Professor"

The way in which we miss the real significant part of our work is perhaps just about as bad and as absurd as that. But if I were to point out what seems to me to be the greatest weakness of deans of men that I have known, and I have known them in increasing numbers for the last ten or twelve years, it is that many of them are utterly destitute of a sense of humor. You can be stupid and perhaps get away with it, and you can make some pretty bad blunders and get away with it, but you cannot be lacking in a sense of humor and expect to get away with it as a dean of men. This is a joyous world and youth is the most joyous time in it, and youth is grasping these humorous things. We, however, take ourselves so solemnly and seriously that we see in these little breaks and flare-ups of youth symptoms that point to the eternal destruction of manhood, when after all it is something at which we may smile, because if we would think back a little bit we would find that we ourselves had done just exactly the same things. If there is one thing that is utterly unchangeable in this world it is youth. It is eternally doing the unexpected things, it is eternally attempting the impossible with the profoundest assurance of success. It is telling you how to run the university, it is telling you what textbooks to select, it is instituting a rebellion against authority. Actually no vaudeville has in it half so much at which you may smile as comes to us over our desks as deans of men. Smile because the boys make mistakes? No, but because youth is youth, because the hope of the world is in youth and it is just this willingness to try new paths, it is just this willingness to try the impossible, it is this eagerness to do the things that have never been done before that gives the world its onward march.

We have had deans speak to us at these conventions, and at the end of the speeches I was very sorry that I hadn't found a convenient funeral that I might have attended instead of listening to their lament. A funeral is only sorrow over the passing of one person, but those speeches are sorrowing over the people of a whole generation of young men and young women, the destruction of humanity. People will not take these things seriously. They are not meant to be taken seriously. They are to be taken in a kindly spirit, since they do not point to anything more than youth's desire to have a thrill.

I suppose most of us feel that we have to defend ourselves mightily if somebody says that some of our students have taken a drink. It is

wrong for them but they don't take it because they want it. They want a thrill. I have taken a drink when I was their age, just for the thrill of it. I did not become a confirmed drunkard. I will guarantee that each of us here has done the same thing, and see what we are now. If you hadn't taken that drink you might have been a university president now. We take those little events in life too seriously, and so when the students come in to us because of something that is wrong we begin to look solemn instead of smiling and not allowing them ever to surprise us. About the surest way to get a grip on a student is never to let him do anything that surprises you. Take it as a matter of course and that makes them feel silly, because they always have an idea that they are going to surprise you, that they are so wicked that they are going to shock you with the unrighteous thing they have done. If you take it as a matter of course and let them talk about it, it quits being interesting.

The first function of the dean of men, to my mind, is to have a sense of humor. If he hasn't got a sense of humor he cannot get it. There is no vaccine that you can shoot into a man if he hasn't got it. He must have "it," there is no question about that. Next he must not take himself too seriously, because, after all, if he does not do the right thing at the particular time it is pretty certain that the earth is going to rotate on its axis. The thing that he does or does not do in a particular instance is not going to change matters in this world very seriously. I have sometimes wondered, when I have seen deans of men worrying over their problems, what they can do by heating themselves up like that. The thing that a dean of men has to do is to do his best with the case that comes before him and then forget it and go to the next task that lies before him. However, having done it, he thinks back and wonders what would have happened if he had done it some other way. It has killed them by the score. We cannot count like that but it has killed them by the fives and tens simply by worrying over what they have done. In 99 cases out of 100 it is not a matter of life and death. It is much better to take action at the time the event occurs, even if it is wrong, rather than to wait and then take action even if it is right. Quick, swift action to the best of your knowledge at that particular time, and then for Heaven's sake quit worrying, and realize that after all God's in his heaven, the lark is in the sky and all that sort of thing. I know one dean who did that, and he had to do something else, he did not come back the next year. He had taken himself entirely too seriously, just absolutely too seriously.

Yet after all, men, with all its annoyances, with all its pitiful pay, with all its misunderstandings and with all the lack of appreciation by your fellow workers, there is absolutely no work that begins to compare with the dean of men's work, just absolutely nothing in this whole universe that is as fine as a young man living up to his highest possibilities, and there is no task that could be given a man that is half so fine and half so inspiring as to be brought into helpful touch with young men by the scores, trying to lead them into a different and better type of living, into a higher conception of life.

I think we sometimes make the mistake of not throwing enough of ourselves into the work. We set up a certain amount of machinery and

make a rule that will cover almost any case, and then make a rule that will take care of that rule. We are very apt to let the machinery run the office of the dean of men, forgetting the fact that after all, unless we throw ourselves into it, unless we give to it the best that we have, the best that we are, whatever our talents may be we will achieve nothing and will help youth not in the slightest.

Honestly, I would rather have the consciousness of having helped some young man into a better life, rather have the consciousness of the affection of hundreds upon hundreds of students with whom I have dealt than to have tonight at my command the wealth of the Rockefellers. This work enriches the life of the student but it infinitely enriches your own.

Dean Doyle: I think those of you who haven't known Dean Coulter realize now why he is so dearly beloved by his former students and why he is the best loved of all the deans of men. I don't think any meeting of our group would be complete without words of wisdom such as we have had tonight from Dean Coulter.

This club is at the service of those of you who may wish guest cards for the Cosmos Club.

In this particular room, which is a converted stable as you may have divined, the American Legion had its birth, and in the original building Dolly Madison held forth. It is a club of national historical and scientific interest.

We shall now stand adjourned until nine thirty tomorrow morning.

FOURTH SESSION

Dean Doyle: Coming to the regular program, it is a great privilege for me to introduce the first speaker this morning. He was formerly a professor in the Department of English and later dean of the Undergraduate Colleges at the University of Chicago. He is managing gradually to live down that period as professor and dean. He is now assistant director of the American Council on Education and today has come one step higher in regenerating himself—he has just been elected as President of the Washington Federation of Churches. It is with great pleasure that I introduce Dr. David Allan Robertson, who will speak to you on the Progress of the American Council Personnel Methods Committee.

MEASURING MEN

Measuring men has always engrossed human beings. In politics Americans, knowing the presidency, recently weighed the qualifications of each candidate for the office. In industry great organizations like the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, the General Electric Company and the Standard Oil Company, employ experts who consider applicants for positions. In education the measurement of candidates for admission to school and college or for promotion from one class to another and for degrees and honors, employs much of the time and strength of teachers.

Scholastic grades have been the usual measures both in business and in college for making academic success and estimating promise. In a recent publication of the Phi Beta Kappa Foundation occur the words:

"What is the magic touch, the hidden principle by which so infallibly Phi Beta Kappa has sifted the men of her many colleges and chosen those who were fated to distinction?" "This is the secret—it has chosen its members among those who in college and university gave themselves to study and won distinction in it." The writer then offers in confirmation of his thesis the record of members of Phi Beta Kappa in "Who's Who in America." Of the alumni of Wesleyan College, 1890-99, eleven per cent of those who were graduated without honors are mentioned in that work; thirty per cent of those who were members of Phi Beta Kappa are included. In twenty-two colleges two per cent of those who won it are named in "Who's Who." The president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company studied the records of 2917 graduates of 61 colleges employed in that large company and related college grades to salaries received in the A. T. & T. Co. He found that forty-eight per cent of the highest scholarship group were in the highest salary group and forty-seven per cent of the lowest scholarship group were in the lowest salary grouping. There would seem to be considerable reason to agree with the Phi Beta Kappa author: "Equally certain it is, though unwelcome doctrine to many, that in general, the measure of one's attainment in school and college is the measure of one's success in life."

But if Phi Beta Kappa has a "magic touch, a hidden principle by which so infallibly" it has sifted the men of her many colleges and chosen those who were fated for distinction, why did only thirty per cent of the Wesleyans become distinguished? Why did only five and nine-tenths per cent of the honor students of the twenty-two colleges attain the distinction of inclusion in Who's Who? Why did only seventeen per cent of the highest scholarship group win a place in the highest salary group of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company? What has become of the seventy per cent of the Wesleyans and ninety-four and one-tenth per cent of the graduates of twenty-two colleges "infallibly" selected for distinction? What has become of the eighty-three per cent of the highest tenth in the scholarship group of the Telephone Company?

Possibly there is some weakness in our measure of distinction. "Who's Who" contains the names of some rascals; and certainly it does not contain the names of all men and especially of all women who have attained distinction in our land. Salary in the American Telephone and Telegraph Company or in any other organization is perhaps not the best criterion for measuring distinction, else we should be obliged to honor some Hollywood star above Woodrow Wilson, and Judas, possessor of thirty pieces of silver, above the penniless figure on the cross.

Possibly, too, there is some fallibility in our measure of scholastic success—college grades. Years ago Dearborn showed that college teachers of the same subject varied strikingly in their practice of assigning A's and F's; some giving ten times as many A's as others did and less than one tenth as many failures. Mayor found that in a period of five years one professor had never permitted a single student to fail out of one thousand whereas another in the same college reported nearly three hundred of each thousand to be failures. Elliott and Starck discovered that one hundred experienced teachers of mathematics assigned grades ranging from twenty-eight to ninety on the same set of replies

on an actual examination paper. At Minnesota in recent months it has been proved that women have as good a chance to graduate if they make twenty-five on a scale of one hundred as men who score thirty-five. "Scandalous," Thorndike called the situation in 1910; and in spite of the great movement for scientific measurement in education which then began, it still is scandalous.

When a student gets a grade of ninety per cent, what is it ninety per cent of? Should grades represent absolute achievement? Should they measure relative success in view of capacity, industry, effort? At present they do both—irregularly. I remember a young instructor who consulted me concerning the grade of John Smith. John had not shown a mastery of the art of composition which would justify the teacher in saying that he was ready for the next higher course in the subject. "But John," she said, "was hampered by the speech habits of his family and neighborhood, by poor school preparation, by the necessity of working twelve hours a week in a garage to earn his way through college; he has tried very hard and shown a fine spirit." You recognize the fallacy? Senator Blank has been convicted of corruption; but he is tenderly kind to his mother. Dr. So and So's unskillful operation killed the patient; but the doctor is one of the most generous contributors to the Community Chest. Achievement and moral qualities we are separating in the schools and colleges. Scholastic grades are becoming more reliable because we are setting up objective comparable measures of achievement. Grades, which bad though they be, are the best measures we have had, may through the use of achievement tests approach more nearly that reliability we have attributed to them in the past; but in these cautious scientific days we are not likely to look for "infallibility." At the same time the virtues of the student, which teachers have generally sought to recognize in some way, can be taken into consideration through a recorded personality measurement.

Achievement tests have engaged the attention of the American Council on Education Committee on Personnel Methods. A sub-committee (H. E. Hawkes, Chairman, V. A. C. Henmon, Agnes B. Leahy, M. R. Trabue, and Ben D. Wood), has prepared for school and college use achievement tests described in the "Educational Record" for October, 1928. Preparation of a B group of tests is in progress. Norms for the tests will be ready this spring. Lack of adequate norms has held back sales of the tests. Nevertheless the first edition of all American Council on Education tests has been exhausted. The American Council Psychological Test was used in the autumn of 1928 by 258 institutions in measuring 82,000 students. An annotated list of all available achievement tests is in preparation by Professor Clifford M. Woody of the University of Michigan, under the auspices of the American Council on Education and in cooperation with the Association of College Teachers of Education.

Of the widespread experimental use of the achievement tests prepared by the American Council on Education it is unnecessary to speak at this time. The Pennsylvania Study of Schools and Colleges conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Education Association and the educational institutions of that state, already affords a very interesting dem-

onstration of the usefulness of achievement tests not only in securing more reliable measurements of individuals but in determining the relative success of colleges in advancing the achievement of their students. In this, Pennsylvania Study confirms the experience of the Modern Foreign Language Study conducted under the auspices of the American Council on Education. Achievement tests have made it possible to measure more accurately some kinds of progress made by students of a subject at the end of a given period in this college and that, in this group of institutions or in that one, in the schools and universities of this country and another. Although this is interesting and important, the chief value of achievement tests is to be found in the more reliable measure of an individual's mastery of a subject. In one large institution in the autumn of 1928 all men in the entering class took achievement tests in all subjects offered for admission and for continuation in first year. These achievement tests showed that 48.6% of these students were more competent in subjects offered for admission than their credentials indicated. For 230 individuals the Dean was able to effect a saving of 1115 semester hours of college work. If this is possible in this institution—and it is not the only one in which such a testing of achievement has had such results—it may yet be possible by substituting measures of mastery for measurements of time to bring about even that economy of time in education for which the American Medical Association and the Department of Superintendence and many individual educators have been pleading for a generation.

Professional schools have revealed an interest in this program. Columbia University Law School and that of Yale have experimented with achievement tests at the professional school level. A scholastic aptitude test for medical students prepared by Messrs. F. A. Moss, O. B. Hunter, and H. F. Hubbard—the two seniors of whom are medical men—and printed by the American Council on Education for experimental use has been given to students in eighteen Class A Medical Schools: (See *Journal of the American Medical Association*, April 27, 1929, David A. Robertson: "Educational Relations of the Professions").

Baylor University Medical School, Dallas, Texas.
 School of Medicine, Boston University, Boston, Mass.
 School of Medicine, University of Cincinnati, Ohio.
 Creighton University School of Medicine, Omaha, Nebr.
 School of Medicine, University of Colorado, Denver, Colo.
 Dartmouth College Medical School, Hanover, N. H.
 Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, N. C.
 George Washington University Medical School, Washington, D. C.
 Hahnemann Medical College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 School of Medicine, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
 Johns Hopkins University Medical School, Baltimore, Md.
 Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tenn.
 School of Medicine, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
 School of Medicine, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
 Syracuse University Medical School, Syracuse, N. Y.
 Temple University Medical School, Philadelphia, Pa.
 School of Medicine, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
 Women's Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

A sample of this test may be secured from the American Council of Education.

It is apparent that for a national program of measuring achievement

a bureau which will prepare or cause to be prepared additional tests and keep records of the results of tests administered and make studies of these records is a present necessity. The movement for more dependable measurement is already an extensive one, involving complex and costly cooperative experiments; but as Arnold makes Empedocles say:

"No eye could be too sound
To observe a world so vast,
No patience too profound.
To sort what's here amassed;
How men may here best live, no care too great to explore."

Along with the movement to evaluate academic progress by measuring what students do has developed the desire to measure personality. What is personality? For centuries theologians have quarreled over the significance of the term. For hundreds of years philosophers have discussed its meaning and still they disagree. In our generation psychologists and more recently bio-chemists, in their talk of duct-glands, have tried to define it. Even now we do not know what it is. But though we have not yet defined electricity, we measure it in terms of what it does. So every day, as I suggested at the outset, we measure men in politics and industry and education; and we especially measure personality by what it does.

The significant things men do can be observed and recorded. Educational institutions need to learn what are these significant things. Some indication of what the colleges had been trying to find out about their students will be found in the Supplement to the Educational Record for July, 1928. At this time I call attention only to the experimental personal record card for secondary schools and that for colleges prepared by the committee of which President L. B. Hopkins of Wabash is Chairman, and of which Mrs. Mary H. S. Hays and Messrs. J. J. Coss of Columbia, D. T. Howard of Northwestern, and J. H. Willetts of Pennsylvania, are members. Of these cards the American Council on Education printed 40,000 secondary and 35,000 college record forms and offered these for sale at cost. Of the first 20,000 have been distributed; of the second, 29,000. Again the Pennsylvania Study under the direction of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching must be named as the user of the largest number of these cards, 18,745. Other institutions have ordered them in quantities from 50 to 1500.

The Council, eager for cooperation in the experimental use of these forms, has encouraged college officers to adapt the card to their peculiar problems. One of the most interesting adaptations has been made by the principal of the East Side Continuation School of New York City, who has ingeniously arranged a form for the Randex file. A committee of the Ninth Annual Industrial Conference at Pennsylvania State College reported a preference for a single card rather than a folder for use in a file. (Pennsylvania State College Bulletin, June 15, 1928. Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Industrial Conference.) Similar preferences were reported at the meeting of the Personnel Methods Committee in Princeton, May 9 and 10, 1929. Another kind of folder is that devised by Wesleyan University. Experience in the use of various forms of accumulative record and of various items of the record will be carefully studied.

The speed and accuracy with which one can secure from these cards data concerning individuals I have tested at more than one college when, representing the Association of American Universities, I have endeavored to discover institutional practice in administering problem cases. Deans of professional schools and representatives of prospective employers are interested in the increasing experimental use of the cumulative personal record card which so conveniently enables one to understand a student in terms of specific things he has accomplished inside and outside of the classroom.

An interesting recent development has been the preparation of a personal record card for college teachers. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at its 1929 meeting decided to require institutions to maintain adequate records concerning the teaching staff. The American Council on Education has submitted a tentative form to the chairman of the Committee of the North Central Association. In cooperation with this and other committees, the Council may be able to develop a form of use to colleges and universities.

Personality measurement in both education and industry has been largely a matter of rating traits. The July, 1928 Supplement to the "Educational Record" contains the story of how colleges have sought by this means to record judgments of their students and how the Committee on Personality Measurement made a simple rating scale for experimental use. This scale to a large extent avoided the pitfalls of the 300 and more traits listed by one member of the committee. It seeks rather to secure answers to colloquial questions regarding things done by the person studied. Of this tentative personality measurement sheet 35,000 have been printed, 2,775 have been distributed as samples and 23,975 have been sold.

Stanford University, Clark University, the University of Washington and the University of Tennessee have decided to incorporate the rating scale in their admission application forms. Certain institutions have used modifications of the form. Some reports have been received from those who have experimented with the rating scale. Miss Beatrice J. Dvorak of the Department of Psychology of the University of Minnesota applied it to graduate students of psychology to determine the reliability of the rating scale as a method of personality measurement. Her studies enable her to conclude that "the scale affords a reliable measure of personality when ratings are secured from a sufficient number of judges under favorable conditions, with each judge willing to cooperate in making careful ratings." A study by Dean Francis J. Bradshaw of the University of North Carolina has shown that a rearrangement of space on the form elicits fuller concrete illustrations of significant actions than the first form of the card. A revision will be issued immediately.

Careful ratings depend upon the ability of raters to observe accurately actions which are significant of personality. Teachers can be trained to make these observations and record them concretely, as has been proved at the University of Chicago. In composition courses students who are required to write character sketches, employing in their themes the technique of the dramatist and narrative writer who illustrate personality by delineating the speech and action of their characters,

have succeeded in observing fellow students and recording evidence concerning deeds which justify a check mark on the rating scale. Indeed the second page of the personality measurement sheet has won cooperation from many principals and teachers who have hitherto been unwilling to use any rating scale. Illustrations of such personality descriptions were printed in the July Supplement to the Educational Record. Here are some actual specimens which have been received from cooperating colleges:

(An applicant for admission to college) "During the course of my association with I have found him to be a steady and reliable worker. When called on for extra work he has never shirked, as for example: One day when I was out of town, Mr., after working his usual length of time was asked to put in a few more hours of work because of the unusually heavy amount of business that had come into the plant. Without quibbling, he cheerfully agreed to do so. When he had put in more than the time agreed upon, he was told that he could go home; but seeing the amount of work still to be done, and knowing that as I was out of town it would take an almost superhuman amount of work from the other employees to get the business out, he refused to go. Instead, he fell asleep in a car belonging to one of the employees and after sleeping only one hour, was up and working again. He had worked thirty-six hours and had had only one hour of sleep. When Mr. first was employed by me, he earned only \$5 a week. When he left, his salary was \$40 a week."

"Last spring, soon after becoming editor of the Tel-Bunch, I appointed Chic Feature Editor for the book (the job of providing humorous filler for the advertising section.) Soon after, about the last of June, I met him by accident and he had already prepared all and more than would be needed and begged for another job that would keep him busy throughout the year. All this was without the slightest urging or suggestion from me. The significance of this anecdote is self-evident."

"He works in a clothing store on Saturdays, belongs to a social fraternity, holds a special insignia for the highest grades in that fraternity, is a member of Sigma Upsilon, plays in the band, and at present writes the humorous column for the Buchtelite. It is clear that he must have some well-ordered schedule to be able to carry on so many activities so thoroughly."

Several college fraternities have shown an interest in the possibilities of the personality measurement sheet in connection with the choice of new men and the development of the characters of their members. In one chapter I have seen ratings of each member by all of the others. These ratings are made at the beginning and at the end of the year. Used by a discreet member of the fraternity who is also a personnel officer of the University, these personality measurements are proving useful in the guidance of men. On the rating sheets of one man I found over and over again a check which indicated conceit, selfishness, or arrogance. From the personnel officer I learned that the lad was shy and probably had an inferiority complex which resulted in certain objectionable defense reactions of the effect of which he was unconscious. The older member in charge of this personnel program expected soon to confer with this student and was confident that out of a confidential chat about his ratings by the other fellows would come an improvement in personality. This device, therefore, leads at once into the field of character education.

"Every man," says Cervantes, "is the child of his works." (*Cado uno es hijo de sus obras. Don Quixote I, 4*). But Browning declares
"Tis not what man
Does which exalts him, but what man would do."

(Saul, xvii, 9)

How are we to discover a man's desires? How can we know the intensity of those desires? Has any psychologist found a way to measure the human will? Professor June Downey's tests are known. Other psychologists are engaged in a study of that emotional phase of personality—Thurstone, Allport, Paterson, Goodwin, Watson. The committee has been especially interested in the Vocational Interest Test designed by Professor E. K. Strong, Jr., of Stanford University, 46,000 of which have been distributed. Vocational motivation has solved the educational problem of many college men. In Colorado a study of the vocational purposes of college students showed that about sixty per cent knew what they intended to do when they finished college; the failures in the first year were largely from the forty per cent of those who had not yet related their college work to their life careers, in which they were determined to succeed. In the eleventh century Guibert de Nogent, when his mother suspected the gallant lying of her student son and stripped his shirt from his small scarred shoulders and wept over them saying that he must give up going to school, cried out, "If I die for it, I shan't stop till I have got my learning and am a clerk." In those acts which a man performs in the intensity of his purpose there is some measure of his will. If we can observe and record those deeds as well as other significant actions we may be able to understand and even measure the personality of a student.

One of the interesting phenomena in education in this country and abroad is the reapproachment between partisans of general education and vocational education, the realization that all education is one. The Vocational Guidance Association, for instance, places now much more emphasis on the second than on the first word of its title. Liberal arts colleges are moving toward the same center and recognizing the possibility that educational guidance of the individual student may include advice as to professors and other vocations, in short the consideration not only of the abilities of the individual and the development of them but their adjustment to an effective and happy life work. To help the colleges in this guidance of their men and women the committee on Vocational Monographs (C. R. Mann, Chairman, W. W. Charters, A. B. Crawford, Emma P. Hirth, and C. S. Yoakum) has published three documents—The Profession of Medicine by Hortense Hoad, Librarianship by Cowley, and Investment Banking by Donald Watt. The University of Minnesota is preparing a monograph on teaching. Some 20 institutions will be invited to cooperate in criticism of these three monographs in accordance with the plan announced in the July Record. It is hoped that the study of these experimental forms will result in an improved model. There is a possibility also that through cooperation with the associations interested in vocational guidance useful monographs for school use may be developed. This committee has also distributed a bibliography of vocational information prepared at the University of Michigan.

There is at present throughout the United State a very strong interest in vocational guidance. The nation-wide broadcasting of discussions of this topic by members of the J. C. Penney Foundation has brought a large response. The demand for expert guidance has rapidly developed. Among those who would satisfy it are many charlatans who advertise themselves as vocational guidance consultants or personality analysts—present day successors of phrenologists and palmists and readers of cards or tea leaves or stars. There is need for caution. Perhaps some day community centers, possibly in connection with schools, will afford a service not only to young persons but to adults.

The Committee on Personal Development was created at the Briarcliff Conference in 1928. The chairman is Dr. Arthur H. Ruggles of Providence, R. I. The other members are: W. W. Charters, J. J. Coss, C. R. Lingley and Dorothy Stimson. As a first step in its program this committee has prepared a bibliography which contains all of the items worth while in the field of personal development and character education at the college level. This list has been compiled by Miss Grace Manson of the University of Michigan and will be published shortly. The committee has also been studying personality development programs of seventy-five institutions of different types in different parts of the country and will send representatives to study what is chiefly contributing to character development in certain colleges.

Tools have been produced through cooperation. Further cooperation will reduce duplication of effort and provide yet more effective tools. In March, 1929, six associations concerned with personnel methods held their annual meetings in Cleveland during the same week and joined in some sessions including one which passed a resolution requesting the American Council on Education to take the lead in arranging for fuller cooperation in a similar conference in 1929. An even larger number of associations may join in the next program.

In the use of the tools and the study of their value there is likewise a fine cooperation with the Council on the part of associations and institutions. In each college too there is evidence of increasing cooperation of administrative officers and teachers. Personnel work in industry, it has been discovered, cannot be isolated. (See Minnesota Personnel Program, p. 3.) Personnel work in education cannot be segregated. Of course there must be a center for the keeping of records and of course there must be leadership. But that leader may be a president or a dean of administration or a dean of men or dean of women, or a registrar or professor of psychology or sociology or education or English, or an alumni secretary or an employment officer or chairman of a curriculum committee. From among such administrative officers or better through the cooperation of all of them, a personnel program will come into being. In this program contributions can be made by the health officer and the department of psychology expert in testing, the department of education proficient in measuring the rate and accuracy of reading and diagnosing and removing causes of failure, committee on scholarships or loans or employment or eligibility; fraternity advisers, heads of dormitories, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. secretaries, chaplains, ministers and physi-

cians in the community, teachers of freshman composition and all teachers. Indeed ideally the personnel program is the responsibility of each teacher. Allocating responsibility for character education to chapel or a compulsory course in ethics, will not make moral men and women; assigning the task of developing correct habits of speaking and writing to an English teacher who has the student one hour a day in a classroom will not make students masters of their mother tongue; and laying on a single personnel director responsibility for discovering individual abilities and guiding their development will not attain the end toward which the personnel program moves. That purpose requires the cooperation of all teachers and others in discovering the abilities of individuals and guiding their development so that the individual may be most effective and happy in adjustment to his world.

Dean Doyle: Dr. Wood, Director of the Bureau of Collegiate Research at Columbia University, will now speak to us.

CUMULATIVE PERSONNEL RECORDS

Dr. Wood: Dean Doyle, Mr. President and Members of the Conference: I shall make my remarks this morning with some hesitation because I have made this so-called speech so many times, and there are so many here who have heard it, that I am afraid it is becoming tiresome to some of you as it is to me. But I promised at the beginning of the Pennsylvania Study that I should repeat this story as often as I could get anyone to listen to it, and so I shall proceed to test your indulgence with malice aforethought.

I believe that both the theory and the practice of the American Council Cumulative Record Folder are prerequisite to the attainment of the main ends for which the deans of men and women in our colleges and high schools are striving. Before looking at the lantern slides which were made available by the Carnegie Foundation, I should like to give you a brief summary of the background against which I hope to discuss them.

We have had deans of men and deans of women in our colleges for a good long time, and in our high schools for some years at least; and we have had a Vocational Guidance movement in this country that has attained to a respectable adolescence. We have set up various and sundry kinds of schools and technical institutions and colleges for special types of study, and, we have expressed very great satisfaction in these great achievements. But still, in spite of all these arrangements, and specially since the doctrine of individual differences began to receive the lip service which we have paid it so assiduously for the past two or three decades, the failures in the high schools and colleges have increased and are increasing to an alarming degree. According to the latest available statistics furnished by the Bureau of Education, the proportion of college freshmen that never reach sophomore standing in the American college is greater than thirty-five per cent. In other words, we are losing more than a third of our freshmen before they reach sophomore standing, and in the end apparently we graduate less than thirty per cent. About two out of seven freshmen get a degree of

some sort or another eventually. This failing rate, if you wish to call it by so ambiguous a term, is just as great in the so-called technical institutions as it is in the colleges of liberal arts, and I believe that it is greater in the high schools and secondary schools than it is in the colleges.

Now, it seems proper to ask a question. Why, since we have set up so many different kinds of schools and colleges, and we have all kinds of special high schools set up in magnificent and expensive buildings, why, in the face of all these provisions, has the failing rate increased insistently and alarmingly? You realize of course that this has involved a great social waste. The money cost is of course stupendous when you consider it in the aggregate. I know a good many state universities through the country that, as they put it, lose nearly half their freshmen every year, and yet every year they go to the legislature asking for larger and larger appropriations so that they can take in more students and so lose larger numbers.

I think the main reason is that we have proceeded on a false philosophy of education. We have set up deans of men, and this Association here represents a splendid movement in our colleges; but so far as I have been able to understand, the deans of men and women feel that they are not doing the job that they would like to do, and when you look at the provisions they have made for discharging that job, we can not be surprised that you do feel you are not doing the sort of work you would like to do. We are asking you to do what I consider the primary function of education. It is the most important function, as I see it, in the whole of educational work, and that is to learn enough about students to advise them about their education and get them fitted for a useful and happy life.

I often compare your work and that of the Personnel Counselor with the work of the physician. We are beginning to realize that the time to call the doctor is when we are healthy so that he can keep us that way. The doctor comes in to see you. He does not look into the medical books to see what some great physician or committee said should be done for you. The good physician makes a thorough study of you as an individual. He not only listens to your breathing and pays attention to your blood pressure and other symptoms, but he calls upon the resources of thousands of different kinds of experts. I recently asked the dean of one of the medical colleges in Pennsylvania what was the primary duty of the doctor in ordinary practice today. He said that 95% to 98% of a good doctor's work was to get information and make the diagnosis, and the rest was giving the prescription and treatment.

We have lamentably neglected that sound principle of medical practice in education. In the time of George Washington, our doctors still looked in the books when the patient came to them, and if you will recall, George Washington himself was probably a victim of that type of practice. The doctors found that he had a fever. They did not perhaps know that it was pneumonia, a malady in which a patient needs every ounce of blood that he has in order to combat the toxic germs. But they looked in the books and found that a patient who was affected like that

should be bled, so they bled George Washington, just as we now take a freshman and tell him, by consulting the formidable college announcement, what studies he must take. If the freshman fails in two or three of those courses, why, we follow the medieval practice of making him take it over again. That is the way the doctors did in the last illness of George Washington. They bled him once; it did not improve him, so they bled him again and he died. Death alone prevented enforcing the prescription a third time. We are doing the same thing by making students repeat courses in which they have "failed" one or more times.

I believe educators are far behind the standards of professional methods employed by good medical practice today. I believe that we are worse off in this most important function of education than our predecessors were during the Middle Ages. We have not only lost sight, apparently, of the first duty, which is to learn what the student already knows, what he can do and what he wants to do, and then try to help him to do that, but we have set up a very involved and complicated system of rules and have become entangled, like many of the gladiators in the old Roman days, in our own net. Many a gladiator has been killed by being caught in the net that he himself has brought on the battleground, and we teachers and deans are just as much victims of this complicated and traditional set of rules as students are.

When we compare our present highly regimented system of mis-called liberal education with the systems of great medieval institutions, you find a number of rather surprising contrasts. In the first place, the teachers in those institutions were very much fewer in number and very much higher in quality of scholarship and interest in scholarly things than the average of our own institutions. In the second place, they had students who were really capable and desirous of getting what we call a liberal education, and they knew these students. They did not treat them in herds as we do, they did not even have set class meetings. Our present scheme of having students march every fifty minutes at the ring of a bell to another classroom and have their slumbers disturbed by people who in the majority of cases are instructors with relatively little in their lives or ambitions or achievements that makes them comparable to the great teachers who really founded the American college, reminds me of a few unhappy months which I spent in the army. We were just marched about a lot during the day. Left, right, left, right. It was generally a boresome thing, and as I stand sometimes and see these college boys march in and march out of the classes smoking cigarettes between classes to keep from boredom, I sometimes wonder how long the people of this land are going to permit this farce to continue, because by our own confessions and "failing" rates, we are admitting that the college is a "failure" for something like five-sevenths of the freshmen. If doctors should administer the hospitals as we administer the so-called educational institutions, the death rate would be greater than five-sevenths.

The answer to this question is to adopt the principle which has resulted in such a marvelous efflorescence of progress in the medical profession, and that is to go over from a disciplinary and rule-enforcing at-

titude, forgetting this monstrous paper curriculum that we make such a fuss about and that students hate, and get down to the most important facts with which we have to deal, namely, the individual students that we get in college, their capacities, their achievements, and their enduring interests. Until we learn these things about our students, how can we hope to do the things that we as deans of men want to do, how can we hope to prescribe for patients that are perfect strangers to us and about whose real ambitions and achievements and capacities we know practically nothing? In the case of a great many teachers in the high schools and colleges, they do not even care to know about these things. Their whole activity in the school is centered around the compulsory classroom ritual, making the whole activity of the institution revolve around the paper curriculum that academic log-rolling has set up as a blanket prescription. Imagine a doctor or committee of doctors who would go into a hospital and formulate ex cathedra a medical course for the patients in that hospital and enforce it as a blanket prescription. That is what we are doing in our high schools and colleges.

When the junior high school movement started, I become hopeful in view of the very straightforward promises to use that period as an adjustment period that these schools would try to learn something about the students and fit the courses of study to the students. So far as I can learn, in most of the cities in this country, the curriculum and administration of courses in the junior high schools is just as disciplinary and punitive in spirit and in practice as it was in the senior high schools. Now that brings us down to what I really meant to talk about, that we must learn more about our students, we must learn it earlier and we must make fewer blanket rules. Contemporary colleges have inherited only one thing, largely speaking, from the great colleges that adorned our early history, and that is their prestige. Their methods, personnel, and carefully defined goals, are practically unknown to us.

We have educated the public to the conditioned reflex that every person has a right to go to college. The most amazing thing to me in this civilization of ours, and the thing which contrasts it most glaringly with the older and more experienced civilizations of Europe, is the fanatical faith of the American Public, especially the taxpayer, in what we call education, especially the college. They have poured out millions without stint for the privilege of having their boys and girls, when they graduate from high school admitted to one of these so-called colleges and get "flunked" out in a few months by the thousand,—and that is what happens by our own confession, by our own college records. After twenty years of such increasing failures, as we define failures, we still have some provisions which no sane man could possibly judge to be adequate to give us the information about our boys and girls which is prerequisite reducing that failing rate, and the complex maladjustments which it implies.

There may be, but I don't believe there is a man here who feels the college is giving him the clerical assistance that is necessary to give him the information about the students whom he advises, that is necessary for really sound and confident advice. I have visited the colleges

that have what passes for the best advisory systems in the country. I don't know of one such place where they really have information about students that is adequate for the type of guidance that we want to give our college boys.

Another thing that marks our colleges as different today from our predecessors in the earlier history of this country is that in those days education was considered to be strictly a unity,—a continuous process. We have what we fondly call the "educational ladder," but, according to one of our English critics, it is more like an elevator than a ladder. We make a great fuss about the passage from the twelfth grade to the thirteenth grade, that is, from high school to college, and I have often wondered why we make such a confusion of noises about that one particular step in this educational ladder of ours. We maintain expensive Admission Departments which succeed in making the passage at that point very unpleasant, without visibly checking the steadily increasing maladjustments and failures. I have often wondered why "admission" is a phenomenon so unique to the thirteenth grade, and whether it is a procedure which is justified on educational or on less worthy grounds. Realizing that education is inherently a process and not an instantaneous event, I have concluded that the admission fuss is not dictated primarily by an educational motive. It seems to be dictated largely by an invidious motive, which is noisily nursed under such ambiguous or meaningless terms as "standards." It seems to go on the assumption that a student becomes a college student by virtue of having graduated from high school, whereas if any individual is really a college student he has been such from birth and ought to be treated as such from birth. Nobody becomes such because he has gone through the ritual of attending classes in high school and in grade school. The passage from the twelfth to the thirteenth grade is not one whit more important educationally than the passage from the sixth to the seventh, the ninth to the tenth, or the thirteenth to the fourteenth grades. Nor can the passage from the twelfth to the thirteenth grade be very significant unless the preceding grade admissions have been wise. If admission were an educational phenomenon it would appear at all grades; but its own history shows it to be not an educational but merely a collegiate device—a device vainly devoted to protecting the prestige and inflating the reputation of the institution, while permitting a frightful increase in academic mortality. Genuine admission is a process and not an act or a single event.

We talk about individual differences a great deal today, we sometimes talk of it as though it were unheard of twenty years ago. As a matter of fact it is very clearly stated in the records of the early colleges in this country. In the early days of the American college and of medieval institutions, the teacher not only knew his students and selected them on the basis of real acquaintance, but having done that, he gave them that freedom without which, apparently, no creative scholarly work has ever been achieved by anybody. It seems to me that nothing could have been devised more diabolical than our present iron clad, lockstep class attendance and promotion system, nothing could have been devised better to destroy all scholarly interest and initiative.

Several unconventional persons, less interested in college education than in the education of college youth, have made quite a number of disconcerting studies on that point. All the students in a given college were divided into five groups: those that never cut classes at all, those that cut half their legal allowance of cuts, those that cut the full allowance, those that over-cut, and those that overcut twice the legal allowance. What were the average grades of those five groups?

Those groups that did not over-cut averaged "D", "D plus," and "C plus." Those that over-cut averaged "A minus" or "B plus." There were a few students who never cut but still had enough time left to learn something. An "A" grade was turned in for some who over-cut freely, but instead of being thankful that the boy could get that much education without being spoon-fed and with less wear on the classroom furniture, his credits were reduced. The orthodox collegiate theory seems to be like that of our penal institutions, that "doing time" is the only way to expiate the sin of ignorance; and that learning, achieved independently, without the spoon-feeding and boredom of enforced class attendance, has not been painful enough to deserve credit.

When Saint Benedict founded the Benedictines about 529 A. D., he made it a rule that the students should spend two hours a day in reading. That is more than most college students spend in reading. Saint Benedict did not say it had to be done at a given minute. Imagine a great creative artist trying to work in the fashion in which we ask our students to work. Imagine Bethoven, for example, writing symphonies from 9 to 9:30, minuets from 9:30 to 10:00 with an automotive device ringing a bell to make him change his tasks, studies and mental impulses four, five and six times a day, and a football rally going on all around to further distract him.

(Dr. Wood explained with the use of slides the "American Council Cumulative Record Card." A splendid pamphlet containing a similar discussion by Dr. Wood is available in "The Educational Record Supplement, Number 8, July, 1928," published by the American Council on Education, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.)

Dean Heckel: I should like to get your reaction to a case that we have at the University of Missouri. We have a young man in the School of Agriculture, who never attended a high school and therefore could not present credits for admission to the university. Being twenty-one years old, he was admitted as a special student. He has now finished the four years of work required for the degree, and he has taken some difficult subjects in the Arts and Science curriculum along with the purely agricultural courses. His scholastic average for his four years' work is "S," the equivalent of a "B" under the usual grading system. In spite of this record, we deny this student a diploma. Those of us who are interested in the case are told that there is no hope that he will be granted a degree unless he completes seventy-five more hours of college work, five hours for every entrance unit that he lacks. Supposedly, we insist upon the fulfillment of entrance requirements merely to insure the selection of students who can do college work. This man, without formal preliminary preparation, demonstrated that he was able to do

college work of high grade. Having completed the undergraduate courses which he deemed profitable, he now desires to pursue graduate study, but is unable to do so for he cannot enter the Graduate School without a college degree.

Doctor Wood: I am afraid to state my reaction too candidly. It seems to me that the mere statement of the admission requirements that you have given is a sufficient answer, for if his marks are not grossly in error, I can't find any reasonable excuse for a prohibition like that.

Dean Heckel: We have an Association of Colleges that tells us what to do.

Doctor Woods: Our schools are disregarding the very thing around which all our activities should center, namely, the individual. It reminds me a lot of the system of credits and demerits at Sing Sing. This system is just like our high schools and colleges.

Two men had been sentenced to a penitentiary for 25 years each. One of them, after his first year, had become a trusty and was permitted to go out of prison and had been for ten years, and the other man had never become a trusty because he was a criminal and boasted about it. But when the criminal applied for a parole, having served two-thirds of his time, they let the criminal out, but would not consider the trusty because he had done only one-half his time service.

Dean Woods: What does the Association of Colleges say?

Doctor Wood: Why should it have a word to say about it? The association is not on the ground and knows nothing about the individual in question. Surely the association does not want to sacrifice sound educational practice on the altar of irrelevant rituals and enforced conformities.

Dean Heckel: What can we do?

Doctor Wood: Well, first I don't believe the associations are as backward as some think they are. I don't believe that any college, that any association, would dare to say a word against an institution that took care of a boy such as you described.

Dean Doyle: We have time for one or two brief questions.

Doctor Wood: We have had some applicants who had not finished all the high school work and we gave them a series of objective tests of intelligence and achievement. If they came up to a certain standard we admitted them conditionally. If they do good college work the formal high school deficiencies are forgotten.

Dean Goodnight: One question I want to ask. I am wondering if there isn't some sentiment in the case discussed by Dean Heckel.

Dean Heckel: I think there is no personal sentiment connected with this particular case. The boy is very unobtrusive. The complaint against imposing work for his degree did not originate with him. Some faculty members felt that an academic injustice was being done.

Doctor Wood: I could give hundreds of cases of that sort in which there is no doubt about the student's ability. In unusual cases we sometimes have given a dozen standardized tests before reaching a decision.

Dean Doyle: Dean Sanders will speak on "Administration of Student Loan Funds."

Dean Sanders: In addition to its endowed scholarships Ohio Wesleyan University annually awards a large number of half-gift, half-loan scholarships, the amounts depending upon the students' need and scholastic standing. The money to underwrite these is appropriated from the University's annual income. The loan portion of the scholarship bears interest at six per cent from the day the scholarship is received by the student. Principal and interest, when paid, are credited to the Student Loan Fund Foundation and from that fund short time loans are made to worthy applicants. In time the Foundation will have sufficient funds to cover both scholarship and short time loans.

The scholarship and loan funds are administered by a Faculty Committee appointed by the President. For years the Dean of Men, as chairman of the Committee, has been held responsible for the care of the funds. The committee, in addition to its regular meetings, gives time to interviewing students prior to the awarding of scholarships.

Freshmen, in most instances, do not receive scholarship aid until they have attained one semester's credit of graduation average. Failure to maintain that average in any semester means forfeiture of scholarship aid.

Obviously, some difficulties arise in handling the awards. We have been accused of favoring athletes, a charge that has not been successfully established. The committee has refused to recognize athletic standing as a reason for granting scholarship aid.

The problem of the relative need of the applicants gives us considerable concern. The committee tries to amass all the significant data possible as a basis for an equitable decision, but this is not an easy task.

We realize, to be sure, that this experiment may be of little use to others. It has helped at Ohio Wesleyan where increased tuition fees threatened to shut the door to students with slender resources.

Dean Massey: I want to call attention to this. Greenleaf has more information about this loan fund than anybody I know. Wouldn't it be better to ask him to mail us a copy of his information on the subject? I think he would be glad to do it.

Dean Coulter: I would like to ask one question, and that is as to the real value of these student loans to undergraduates. I have had years of experience and I am inclined to think that the ability of the student to find an easy way out of his financial difficulties has not made for his success in the future. I am so thoroughly opposed to the general theory of student loans for these purposes, that a sum of twenty dollars was, upon my advice, turned from student scholarships to library funds for special purposes.

Dean Doyle: If there is no further discussion of Dean Sander's paper, we will now adjourn for the morning session.

FIFTH SESSION

Friday, April 12, 1929, 2:30 P. M., Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The Chairman: It is a very agreeable and satisfying experience for me to present to you the Hon. Ray. Lyman Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, the distinguished educator and President of Stanford University. He is a friend to everyone, seriously and honestly engaged in the work of education. Doctor Wilbur will speak to you on "Shifting Standards of Student Conduct."

The Hon. Ray. Lyman Wilbur: Mr. President and Members of the Conference: In the first place I would like to qualify as a witness among you men who are experts in your field. I lived for several years in a large dormitory on the Stanford campus. Later I returned there as an instructor, subsequently as a physician, practicing in the university community for three years. I went to Europe for six or seven years. I have had some experience with medical students, and know something of student life abroad and in this country, and now have had some experience as President of Stanford University over a period of a number of years. That period covers certain definite shiftings that have come into the college and university life of this country. Perhaps the most significant change has been the lack of interest that has gradually developed in class organization. With the rigid curriculum and the compact classes of twenty five or thirty years ago, all of the men living under similar conditions and all taking work that was very similar, there were opportunities for class association and for the development of certain standards. But conditions have so greatly changed with the growth in our student bodies that I think we face an entirely different situation.

If you run into the alumni of the years that have gone by, they do not understand our present student bodies at all. As you know, the one thing that you can always rely on is for an old college man to think he is an expert on how everything about the college should be run. That is normal, it seems to be one of the natural things that come to everyone with a diploma, but the present group of alumni or graduates do not grasp what is going on. They do not understand your responsibility when they send their sons to our universities. They are rather loath to try to follow the thinking of the boy. You know that during this period there has been a great increase in the size of student bodies, a great extension in the scope of the curriculum, inability of the institutions to maintain housing facilities, and the growth of fraternities as a great housing organization. The development of the boarding house is coming around to certain of our campuses, and when those who keep boarding houses are voters, they are often very important factors in dealing with university problems, particularly in state institutions. So, if you consider these combinations of things you will see that there have been marked changes.

Even more marked have been the changes in the environment of the youth of today. There has been a great spread in the amount of information available to the young, and there has been a greater freedom

in giving them information of all sorts. Many people think they get too much, but they get it at any rate, and they get much information that in the years gone by came from the street corner or in a surreptitious way. They get it and get it openly, sometimes even in the classroom, so that it is a new thing from the standpoint of the college graduate of twenty five years ago what the college boy and college girl has to face today, and there are many reactions to it.

What sort of standards do the boys have now compared to those of twenty five years ago? Has there been any essential shift in the emphasis of youth upon the things that are worthwhile? I think there has been some, and in the right direction. When I was a freshman and a sophomore I had very distinctly the attitude of the student toward the teacher. I thought of the college professor as a teacher, you know what that feeling is, you undoubtedly still have it when you come in contact with some of your old school teachers, a peculiar combination of respect and awe—even reverence—that is inculcated in the schoolroom when the teacher is a real man or a real woman. That feeling teaches proper relationship and it has by no means disappeared. Take for instance the honor system which has now been adopted in many institutions. The real difficulties that the honor system has to face are associated with a peculiar complex by which the student still thinks of the teacher as somebody whom he must tell about his fellow student who may have done something wrong. He fails to recognize that the modern college or university group is a learned group with a definite and intimate responsibility to every member of that group.

The diploma that a man gets from an institution is supposedly earned by him. If it is a clean diploma, one that he has earned by square and satisfactory work, he can be satisfied with it, but if it is contaminated by a whole group of other diplomas that are a little smoky or perhaps dirty, there is no way by which he or the public can distinguish after graduation between grades of diplomas that have been given, so that the honor system should be maintained by a self-protecting organism, not by a student teacher complex. None of us hesitates either to stop playing cards with the man that cheats in cards or to throw him out, so why should the students hesitate to throw out the student who cheats them? He does not cheat the teacher.

I think that in the shifting of standards there has been more and more of a tendency for the honor system to become sound. This is due to the acceptance of responsibility by the students as individuals and as groups, and in that I see the best opportunity that we have in our universities for the development of new standards of conduct and of new opportunities for the development of responsible citizens.

As you know, the principal difficulties we have in government outside are due to the failure of the citizen to take a participating part in the more troublesome details of government. "Somebody else's job—let somebody else do it" is the thing he says. When in our universities we can teach our men and our women that they have to develop responsibility to themselves and to each other for the maintenance of standards,

I think that they will go on into our civilization and be of great consequence.

Every group of students, it seems to me, has about the same general run of people in them. We have the reckless boy, the boy with great initiative. We have a very small percentage of worthless men, but a great majority of our students are of a fine type. They go ahead and do their work well and give us comparatively little difficulty. I think too that there is about this present group of boys and girls a little more of a sense of human dignity than we have had at times. I cherish that more among young men than anything else, a sense of human dignity and self-respect. Some people object to it because they think that the man does not get on the boat as fast as he should. Looking back over the years, the man who failed to get on the boat but who had a sense of human dignity, who did the thing he thought was right, is the man that does things, that really counts in his profession and in the world outside.

Therefore, in this shifting of standards, I hope that we can always make a place for initiative, make a place for the individual that respects himself. That is the thing I have against fraternity initiations, as they are often practiced, they are not in keeping with human dignity. They are degrading and unwholesome. If a permanent organization makes that a part of its plan of admission, they are starting wrong, in my judgment, in the development of manhood. Young men have enough things to make them cynical, suspicious and critical. I think that one of the great problems before our fraternity system is to make it seem worthwhile to a man that has a sense of human dignity and decency and wants to be himself, not just one with a common label. The fraternities have failed in some ways to live up to their full responsibilities. One reason is the economic pressure. When the fraternity was a reasonable size, eighteen men we will say, there was the opportunity for common ideals and for the men to aspire to make that fraternity one of leadership in every direction, but when the group grows to thirty that is too large for that particular purpose. In my experience, it results in the breaking up of the organization into a majority and a minority group, and results in a dip in the record of that organization.

There is little, I think, that the alumnus can do about it. He tries, but the more I have watched the development of these groups the more I think it requires a certain process of evolution to bring about results. The organizations such as fraternities eventually sense their responsibility and become proud of their actual accomplishments.

The athletic system has undoubtedly played a part in pulling down some of the scholastic ideals of our institutions. On the whole I think its effect has been most wholesome and advantageous in developing the sense of fairplay and meeting the game no matter what it may be. Smiling in defeat and all that sort of thing makes athletics most desirable, but when it becomes the only aim of a group to develop athletic supremacy, then, you see, it begins to slip in another direction. It is natural enough for the young to over-emphasize their enthusiasm, there is a great opportunity for enthusiasm in athletics. But, as you well

know, we can trust our athletic records to the undergraduates better than we can to the graduates. If our university athletics were run according to the standards of the graduate, who wants the satisfaction of picking up the morning's paper and reading that the team of his college has won, college athletics would be almost professional.

Now, in this sketchy talk I have not tried to cover very much of the field but I have tried to indicate that it is important to watch the forces that are at play in the university and on the outside if we are to be of real assistance in handling the day-to-day problems of men. It must have been a tumultuous experience for a boy eighteen or twenty years old to have gone through any one of the last eighteen or twenty years, especially during the post war period with all of its changes, with the different attitude toward religion, the Sunday school, the preacher, the teacher, the universities with their boys thrown out in the public eye with published accounts of athletic activities, every escapade of the college boy given emphasis in many of the papers of the country, and along with that the absorption of the radio and everything that it brings, good and bad, the automobile with the wide distribution which it offers to the activities of the young, and the marked change in the literature that is available to the youth of today. Yet our boys and girls have had to go through all this experience, one that adults dreaded for them. I think you will agree with me, as you look over these fine groups of boys and girls in the American universities, that they have gone through that period full of the things that I have mentioned and many others, and that we have today as fine and clean and upstanding a group of young men and women as the world has ever seen.

If we can live with them at their best and keep the university so that there is a place where they can operate at their best, then I think that we can have a real sense of security as we look forward to the future of this country of ours.

The Chairman: On behalf of this organization I want to thank you for the talk. Dr. Wilbur will be here for a few minutes, if any of you care to ask him any particular question.

Dean Doyle will take the chair.

Dean Doyle: Dean Goodnight will speak on the "Control of Inter-collegiate Athletics."

Dean Goodnight: May I present as a starting point for my brief discussion this afternoon the general conclusions at which Mr. Elmer Berry arrives in his rather erudite psychological study entitled "The Philosophy of Athletics," published by the A. S. Barnes Co., New York, in 1927?

"This thesis has presented an educational basis for athletics. It has found this in the psychology underlying big-muscle activity. This furnishes the foundation for the social, ethical, emotional, and character building values of athletics which are inherent in the big-muscle, team, fighting games, and which develop from these games. The importance of the right leadership and the responsibility of educational authorities for improved athletic administration is obvious. The present ethical situation in athletics, while bad in many of its details and in need of

urgent attention on the part of educational authorities, is surprisingly good. Leaders of physical activity believe in high standards of sportsmanship, are working for them and, generally speaking, are supported in their efforts. The football coaches of the country around whom the stress and strain of intense athletic competition centers are men of high ideals, who believe in football as a character building activity, and are devoting themselves to it for that purpose. There is a great need of support from educational authorities which will make their efforts for good sportsmanship more effective. Nevertheless, they are standing for high ideals and are securing gratifying results. Students are greatly influenced by the leaders of their physical activity. Their leadership is based on the personality of the leaders and is "carrying over" into life.

"Athletics today have a high ethical content and are making a high ethical contribution to modern education. Educational authorities have the power of increasing this contribution." (Berry, "The Philosophy of Athletics," page 136.)

Four times in this half page of conclusions does Mr. Berry lay at the door of educational authorities the responsibility of doing something for much needed improvement in the administration of intercollegiate athletics. With the exception, of course, of a few avowed and uncompromising enemies of athletics in any form (and there are a few nuts of this type, I take it, in every university) it is quite the fashion in faculty circles to lay the blame for the evils which inhere in our athletic system upon a sport-obsessed public, upon the sports writers, the gamblers, the commercial interests which benefit by big games, and, to some lesser degree, perhaps, upon alumni, coaches, and student bodies. It is something of a jolt to faculty complacency, I take it, to have a writer of some prominence come along who lays wholly at the door of us faculty folk the responsibility for doing something about it. Just what we are to do, or just how we shall set about it, he does not specify in detail. But in his chapter on Athletic Administration, he stresses the good work which has been done by various national and regional athletic unions, in the college world by such conferences as the Big Ten, the Southern, the Missouri Valley, and the Pacific Coast, and declares that: "These groups will never be efficiently organized and become powerful educational and executive bodies until they see fit to employ supervisors or 'commissioners' of athletics as the Western Intercollegiate Conference has done. It is well to get together and talk. But what is everybody's business is nobody's business. Unless there is some agency to carry into execution the resolutions adopted and ideas presented, little progress is made. This cannot be done by committees made up of men already overloaded and widely separated. There must be an executive officer whose business it is and who devotes his time to promoting the educational propaganda and carrying into execution the definite decisions reached by the conference. Results cannot be secured with the expenditure of time, effort, and money. The failure of educational institutions to relize this and to provide for such officers before is one of the reasons why more has not been accomplished. The 'Commissioner of Athletics' represent a forward step in athletic education and adminis-

tration. Every athletic conference should provide such a supervising individual who by earnest, conscientious service may advance the work of the organization and more rapidly assist in securing ethical values from athletics." (Berry—pages 132-3.)

That would seem to imply that in the Big Ten our problems were all solved. But I talk to men of our Big Ten institutions, I find no serious inclination to assume a pose of sanctity and to regard our general athletic situation as perfect, by any means. We realize, I think, that our problems are as grave as they are elsewhere. We appreciate that the Conference and Commissioner Griffith have accomplished much for the betterment of conditions, and those of us who are old enough to look back 25 years and more perceive that there has been a big advance along some lines. But there has been retrogression, I fear, along some others. It is very true that not all motion is progress. Nor all commotion. If it were, we should be making tremendous strides! But commotion is one of our greatest difficulties. It is not an uncommon thing for a homecoming or championship game to disrupt most of the academic work of an institution for the entire week-end. And if I may be pardoned for infringing slightly upon the next topic, the discussion of which is to be opened by Dean Armstrong, I might observe that a single homecoming or championship game may disrupt the work of both participating institutions for quite a period of time. What is our duty as educators with regard to this situation?

Another tendency, the wisdom of which I am inclined to question, is that of continuously increasing the number of sports, teams, and matches. Some time ago we had four or perhaps five intercollegiate sports, each in its season. Then we began to hear these called major sports, to distinguish them from an ever growing list of minor sports. Now these have waxed and grown fat, and we have begun doing away with the distinction between major and minor. Wrestling, boxing, swimming, hockey, gym team work, skating, skiing, tennis, and golf all have now as formidable a schedule of intercollegiate matches as do football and basketball, track, baseball, and crew. Of course, if one holds that athletics are a good thing, it is difficult not to go the whole way and admit that more athletics are a better thing. But I am inclined to think that less intercollegiate sport and more intramural games is a sounder program. If we invest our surplus funds in facilities for the whole student body, instead of spending them all in increasing the schedules of teams which always play at a loss, we are making what appears to me a wiser decision. Can we as faculty people and educational authorities have a deciding influence on this policy?

Sportsmanship calls for equality of competition. Virtually all colleges and universities now have the freshman rule and limit competition to 3 years. West Point refuses to observe the latter limitation. A man may play 3 years at a university, then go to West Point and play 3 years more. And yet, at a recent meeting, our Big Ten voted that Big Ten teams might schedule games with West Point.

In the Big Ten, seven institutions have no eligibility requirements other than those required by the Conference, viz., no deficiencies in

scholastic work. A man may have finished his preceding semester with four Ds and be perfectly eligible. In two other of the institutions a C average is required by the faculty in addition to the Conference requirements. In the other, a weighted average of 77 is required which is slightly below a C average. A recent study by an educational statistician considers the records of all athletes of a Conference institution in 5 major sports during 3 semesters and shows that the Conference requirements alone would have debarred 12½% of the men from participation, whereas the additional requirement of a C average for the preceding semester would have barred 44½%. Assuming that the same general proportions hold true in the other institutions of the Conference, there is obviously a good deal of unfairness in pitting teams of one institution which can use 87½% of its athletic material against those of another which can use only 65½% of its strength. Shall the latter institution be penalized because its faculty insists on the maintenance of sound academic standards? Is this a field in which we as educational authorities ought to take a stand?

A real abuse that is exceedingly difficult to detect is the recruiting and the financial supporting of athletics by wealthy and sportily inclined alumni. It is done in each and every Conference institution. Not with the knowledge and consent of the institution, be it understood. For all we can tell, the men are bone fide students, who are paying their own way and doing their scholastic work well enough to keep eligible. But every once in a while, one discovers after the graduation of a certain player, that he was a mere hireling, recruited and supported through his college course by some alumnus who imagined that he was rendering a great and important service to alma mater in so doing.

One very important reason for raising the eligibility requirements to include the C average, it seems to me, is that the athletes who can be recruited and hired to play for an institution are rarely good students. The C average requirement would eliminate the majority of them automatically. But is there still some other method which we as educators can pursue to discountenance and discourage the hiring of gladiatorial oaves to play our student games?

A less important matter, but one which nevertheless causes some disgruntlement between institutions, is the difference in financial methods at various colleges. For example, our Conference requires that all students be admitted to games at the rate of 50 cents each. Some schools extend this rate to all employees of the institution; others do not. Some limit the 50 cent rate to the purchasers of coupon books for the year; others let all students enjoy the 50 cent rate, either for a single game or by the year. Some admit all letter men free; others do not. Some have larger stadia than others. The result is that a game between A and B on A's campus may be a good deal more profitable than a game between the same teams on B's campus. Since gate receipts are split on a 50-50 basis, this leads to jockeying in the arrangement of schedules to avoid the less profitable games and to go in for the more profitable ones only. The same thing holds true in the scheduling of non-conference games. There are also questions of policy in such

matters as intersectional games, post season continental jaunts, post season championship games, and the like. Should we as faculty officers seek to play a part in bringing about a correction of some of these evils, and an adjustment of some of these disputed points?

I am sure that some one is ready to rise at this juncture and point out that that is the function of the Conference itself. It is made up of faculty representatives; its primary purpose is to consider just such matters, to submit referenda to the faculties when it is deemed advisable and to adjust by arbitration or by legislation matters of precisely the character of those I have mentioned. Quite true, but the conference has been in existence 3 decades, it has had a Commissioner for the past five years, and still these evils which I have pointed out remain uncorrected. The Conference representatives would undoubtedly reply that they have no desire to deprive the various institutions of their autonomy. And so we wag along, with the evils growing worse because it seems to be the business of nobody in particular to correct them. I believe that we, as deans of men, can, if we will work together, with mutual confidence and good faith, have a considerable influence for good on a situation which calls loudly for betterment.

I hope there is not a dean in the country who hasn't read Rollo Walter Brown's superb biography of Dean Briggs. I know of no single book which contains between two covers more heartening inspiration for struggling deans of men than this well written work. Granting that it may be overdrawn, and that no mortal man ever reached quite the pinnacle of perfection in wisdom, judgment, courage, and achievement here depicted, it still remains a marvelous stimulant for every man who is battling to fulfill conscientiously the arduous position of a dean.

The chapter which Mr. Brown labels "An Idealist in Athletics" ascribes to the influence of Dean Briggs prodigious progress in establishing right ideals of sportsmanship, removing longstanding evils and promoting mutual confidence and understanding between Yale, Princeton, and Harvard during the seventeen years in which he served as chairman of the Harvard committee on athletic sports. I quote: "Before he retired from his post in 1924, the change had been so great that he himself was able to say, 'I don't know of a place in the country where a Harvard man is more hospitably received than at Yale.' On another occasion, when some one questioned him about eligibility rules, he remarked: "I would just as soon leave a question of Harvard eligibility to Corwin or Mendell at Yale as to any Harvard man I know. If I had any fear at all it would be that Harvard would be favored in the decision.' Truly a long step from the Springfield days!"

But he was not content even with this unbelievable progress. 'I look for the time,' he wrote in his annual report in 1922, 'when Harvard, Yale, and Princeton shall say to one another, 'I need know nothing more about the legitimacy of your players than is implied in your willingness to play them.' " (Rollo Walter Brown—Dean Briggs, page 187.)

To be sure, a cynic might well point out that within 3 years from the time of the Dean's retirement, Harvard and Princeton had had a major athletic row and had discontinued athletic relationships, a situa-

tion which obtains, so far as my knowledge goes, to the present day. But who will not admit that the mere fact that an era of good feeling and good sportsmanship did exist in the Big Three for many years will make the restoration of such a relationship much easier than if it had never been? And is not a similar achievement in our respective spheres a tremendously worthy goal for us to strive for? If from this discussion there shall come an attempt on our part to come to agreement on two or three major matters which deserve our attention and to devote our effort to affecting an improvement in these, I believe we shall be accomplishing something very much worthwhile. To make concrete suggestions that will bring the matter before us for discussion, I propose to my fellow deans in the Big Ten institutions that for one year's time we bring all the influence that we can wield to bear on the athletic committees, on the conference representatives, and on our colleagues in our respective institutions to accomplish one or two distinct objectives. Whether these objectives shall eventually be achieved by Conference action or by the action of individual faculties is immaterial. The point is that we are now standing still. Can we not get some action?

As suitable aims for such an attempt, I suggest the equalizing of financial practices and of eligibility requirements in the ten institutions. Let us work for a definite uniform practice in Conference institutions with regard to admissions. Shall the 50 cent admission apply to students only or to all employees as well? Shall the student be compelled to buy a coupon book in order to procure his 50 cent rate, or shall he enjoy the privilege of purchasing a single ticket at 50 cents whenever he wishes? Shall letter men pay or be admitted free? Shall the players be entitled to few or many complimentary tickets for their friends?—incidentally a fruitful cause of scalping! These may seem minor matters which might well be left to the individual institutions. But I point out again that they are a cause of perpetual jockeying and juggling in schedule making which does cause much friction and bad feeling. It matters not so much how these questions shall be answered, but it does matter greatly that they should be answered uniformly in all ten of our allied institutions.

The C average requirement is in the interests of both scholarship and of equality of competition. It is also a healthy blow at hirelings. It should be accomplished through conference action after submission to the various institutions. As I see it, we can help in two ways,—first by agitating through our representatives, and second, by working among our colleagues for the passage of the resolution when it comes to our respective faculties.

And, finally, I suggest that we take a hand in any controversy or quarrel that may arise between any two of our institutions. By corresponding directly and showing toward each other complete frankness and truthfulness without reservation, the two deans of men in the institutions concerned, may each get the institutional point of view of the other clearly in mind, and, by working with the athletic committee of his own school, bring about the removal of a misunderstanding which might easily develop into an open rupture if left unhealed. In this field,

Dean Briggs was a pioneer whose illustrious example we may all follow with profit to our institutional life and relationships.

Dean Thompson: I realize that these problems that have been mentioned in this splendid paper are all incidental to the whole situation. I think that since I have been occupying the position of chairman, we have probably gone through as serious a time regarding athletics as any institution in the country.

It seems to me that the most serious situation that faces us in our institution is stabilization as regards employees in our own institution. I realize that the things Dean Goodnight has mentioned are incidental and perhaps important. Here is the situation as I see it, and it is very serious.

We have built up a spirit of "win" in this country, in our intercollegiate athletics and in football. We have built that up, particularly in the state institutions and the large institutions, to a point that unless a coach wins about so many games during the season, he is shortly discharged, and then if the directors can't bring in a winning coach after one or two seasons the directors are discharged.

One of the things that we can do to strengthen the situation is to stabilize the coach's position in the institution. I have heard it said on the part of one of the coaches of the Big Ten Conference that two coaches were together before the game. One of them said, "You are sitting pretty down here, but I need this game."

Something needs to be done to assist the coach and to make him feel that he is a part of the institution and to make the public feel that. We in the Big Six propose to have a Committee of Investigation. Such a committee will come into an institution where they are having trouble of this kind and find the facts, much like the University Professors Association. The publicity given to the facts might serve to strengthen the position of the institution as against the public and a few alumni.

Dean Clark: I am very much interested in what has just been said and think that many of the suggestions might be profitably carried out. However, I think that if an organization of deans of men undertakes to give too much attention to athletics, if done openly, it may do more harm than good.

Dean Moore: I think that with all of us this is a rather delicate matter and as a matter of fact the athletic problem is going to remain a problem for some time to come. I have recently been working with a committee in the faculty of the University of Texas in a general study of the athletic situation in our institution with a view to recommending changes in organization. In our committee the statement was recently made that there are a number of Eastern institutions which separate intercollegiate athletics entirely from other athletic activities. May I ask if this is true in any of the institutions represented here?

Dean Stone: Our director of physical education is entirely independent of the director of athletics. The stadium and its use is under the control of our director of athletics. An appropriation from the State provides a liberal allowance to maintain the salaries and the expenses

of the operation of the Field House where our intra-mural events take place.

Dean Gauss: That is not the case at Princeton. I think we have a rather complicated system. We have a board of athletic control, which is under the chairmanship of a member of the faculty. We also have a director of physical education. The two are very closely connected. We also have the faculty committee and both of these men are influential members.

Dean Park: Since the World War we have an enormous development of stadium building. Since the World War we have had a great increase in the price of admission to our games. It always makes one interested in the value of any reform movement particularly when anything is suggested by a man of distinction such as Dean Briggs.

Dean Coulter: The question is whether we are running a university or a turnverein. It used to be the idea that a college was a place for intellectual training. We accept the idea that a university is a place for training athletes with incidental training intellectually. I am rather convinced that it would be a little cowardly not to attack this problem squarely and fairly.

Even if it is necessary to abolish some physical directors and reduce the salaries of some of the coaches, let us see if we can not get a condition where the emphasis is placed on the intellectual side rather than on the physical side. We must realize that after all the States did not endow and establish these institutions in order that they might develop a set of professional athletes or to serve as dancing academies.

The Chairman: The next paper will be by Dean J. A. Armstrong of Northwestern University who will speak on the "Student Migrations to Athletic Contests."

Dean Armstrong: Goeffery Chaucer spoke of the time for pilgrimages as being in April when the showers had pierced the cold of March to the roots and bathed every vine with the warm rains that bring forth the flowers. The modern pilgrimages however do not take place in April. The mild September sun and the crisp haze blue October days when the avenues and woods are garbed in scarlet and gold, and the clear blue days of October with its bracing air are signs of the time for modern pilgrimages. Each Saturday during these months life begins to stir in the dormitories, fraternity and sorority houses on various campuses at an unusually early hour. There is much calling back and forth from windows to street and much roaring of motors and honking of horns, and scurrying and scrambling, as freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors in small groups and big groups, pile into small cars and big cars, and hesitatingly or confidently start out on the great adventure—first to see whether a distant town can be reached either with or without assistance; second, to assist vociferously in winning a football game (plan subject to change without notice); third, to meet the varying circumstances of victory or defeat with proper ceremony; and fourth, to attempt to reach home.

Nor are these the only pilgrims. A short while after the motor cavalcade has disappeared another exodus begins. This time most of

the remainder of the student population rushes out with suitcase and raincoat, catches the nearest street cars and elevated train and makes a mad rush for the long lines of special trains wherein are already gathered the hosts of loyal alumni, and also a more varied horde of baker, banker, merchant chief who desire to follow in person the fortunes and vicissitudes of their favorites. Gathered together are certain other functionaries like the vendors of Babe Ruth bars and the serious countenanced attaches of the Dean of Men or Women. And then the whistles blow, the trains depart. The shouting and the tumult dies. As for the campus it is deserted. No one remains save the janitors, the poorest of the poor, a few conscientious objectors, and certain light fingered gentleman who make an honest living by calling at fraternity and sorority houses when all but they have fled.

In comparison with the modern football migrations, Chaucer's pilgrimages were both dull and adventureless. I defy Chaucer to compare the chances for success of the worst nag ridden by the ancient pilgrim to this modern rubbed-tired nag with signs written on it, such as, "7000 jolts," "This way out," "Scalp the Illini," "Beat the Badgers," "Hell Bent for Hanover," and so forth and so on to the limitless ingenuity of the American College Boy.

The ancient pilgrimages were for religious purposes. I am not sure that the thousands and thousands of modern American pilgrims who crush their way into the small town and within a few hours transform it in to a great city are not religious pilgrims too—those who travel to the pillared shrines of the great god "FOOTBALL." At any rate, this unusual popularity which football holds with the American people has given rise to a very serious problem in university administration—that of the student migration to intercollegiate athletic contests.

It is a problem isn't it! This great trek that the college administrator must face at least twice during each football season. It is not a matter of safeguarding the lives and conduct of a few students. Involved is a horde of undergraduates, and the mixing of students with alumni and townspeople adds further complexity to the situation. To have two thirds of your population stringing along the highways and railways that lead to a neighbor university with the knowledge that the chances are about 3 to 1 that some of them will have accidents of minor or major kind before they get back is something for you to worry about.

And nowadays what university is not your neighbor? A considerable number of Dartmouth students came out to Chicago to attend our recent Dartmouth Northwestern game. In modern reckoning the distance is a bit expensive but not far. Distances of three hundred to five hundred miles are close enough to attract the greater portion of the students. It takes long armed and competent administratives to hope to fulfill their interest and responsibility in this situation.

As I look at the task of formulating ones attitude and program on Student Migrations there are several aspects of the problem which, though over-lapping, may be separated as factors to consider: first, the matter of the special trains. There is something to be considered here.

Need you, and can you handle the special trains, and the conduct on the trains. Second, the matter of students driving in busses or automobiles to away from home games. What is the need for control here if there is a need what can you do that is practicable and feasible? Third, how do the alumni and townspeople, and hangers-on, in their presence on the special train affect the situation? Do they complicate the situation? What can be done? Fourth, what is the problem of the conduct of your people at and after the game—in visiting fraternity houses, at the dances, in the public places? Fifth, from the standpoint of expense entailed, the tax made on the endurance and health of the student, the effect upon scholarship and everything in general, what should comprise university administration's attitude toward students attending the out-of-town game?

Regardless of our attitude, when you ask the undergraduate what he thinks about the trip to the out-of-town game his answer contains mention of several things which he considers to be of value. Student attendance en masse at out-of-town games gives support to your team. Winning teams bring prestige to your university. Back your team. He says too that going to the out-of-town games gives you a chance to look over other universities. It has an educational value in that you can see how other schools do things, what equipment they have, and in general you get a chance to size up the other institution. Furthermore it gives fraternity men and sorority girls a chance to get acquainted and visit with the men and women of other chapters. Again there are very few other times when a person can see these institutions. The low rates make the trip possible. Possibly the biggest reason that is given is that the out-of-town trip offers an opportunity for a "Big Time." Everybody goes, you all have a lot of fun. It is a colorful experience.

And I believe that even a superficial investigation will verify certain values. I remember that as a student my introduction to the city of Chicago and the great University of Chicago was through the enthusiasm engendered and cheap fares offered by a football game with that institution, and although the trip was hurried, I did take the opportunity to see something of the University of Chicago and the city. Many of our students would never see these neighbor institutions were it not for the out-of-town games. I suspect that the out-of-town game spurs some of us to visit each other. Is there any question but that these friendly contacts benefit students, institutions and the college world? Some of the students do take advantage of the opportunities offered by the trips. The president of our Men's Union used the Illinois-Northwestern contest as an opportunity to watch the Illinois Union in action at Homecoming and as a chance for the interchanging of ideas. I found our students walking through the library and other university buildings and looking over the fraternity and sorority houses. The friendly exchanges of bands, cheerleades and students tend to break down much of the suspicion, false impressions, and hostility that sometimes mars relations between universities. There are not many exceptions to this I believe. And again, after these contests one can find in

the paper and in their conversation echoes of their impressions and reactions.

The presence of value however does not mitigate the difficulties connected with them. It is the motor tragedies, unlicensed conduct on special trains, drinking at the games or at the parties after the games, inebriated celebrations of victory or drowning of defeat, heavy colds, worn out bodies, and neglected lessons that have made lurid news for the sensational press and given grave concern to the universities. And I take it that even allowing for different organizational set ups we all have some responsibilities to perform in the matter.

What is being done? But first we might consider what has been done. In the mid-west perhaps the first action taken in the matter was taken two years ago by the "Committee of 60" consisting of college presidents, presidents of boards of trustees, faculty men and other representatives. This committee mentioned the seriousness of the situation and urged the Big Ten conference athletic directors to take up the matter in their annual meeting. The conference directors in turn considered the problem. It was reported by one director that on returning from an out-of-town game four baggage cars had been added to the special train and bad conditions had developed in the unchaperoned dancing that had gone on all night. It was reported that after another football trip to a large city many of the students did not get back until the middle of the following week. As a result of the discussion the directors agreed to discourage attendance at out-of-town games. One institution urged that no tickets be sold to students from the visiting school but that action was considered too strong. But at the end of the years trial the directors did not believe that the migrations had lessened to any noticeable extent and partly on account of this fact and possibly for other reasons, they devised the plan for the two team system i. e. for each institution to play two teams each Saturday so that a home game would always be played. Again at the close of this last season however, I believe that it was frankly admitted that the system had had no effect on the migrations. During the season people attended football games throughout the United States and some migrated between institutions.

In the meantime and perhaps prior to this, many institutions have inaugurated regulatory measures. I hope that in the discussion which is to follow my talk many of you will tell us what your institution has done in the matter. I shall attempt here merely to describe some of the types of measures that have been taken. At Northwestern our action has been in the regulation of the special trains and in placing certain regulations on the girls who attend the games. Our special trains are run as an activity of the undergraduates athletic association. It is first necessary however for the president of the association to petition our Board of Supervision of Student Activities three weeks in advance of the game for permission to run a special train. This enables us to stipulate the terms under which the train is to be run. An undergraduate appointed by the Athletic Association president is placed in charge of the train. He furnishes us with approximate times at which the train can be run. If advisable the time of the trains arrival and de-

parture is adjusted to conditions. It may arrive late and depart early. In connection with this point it is appropriate to add that we have always found the railroad officials to be very courteous and willing to cooperate in the making of arrangements. If the trip is to be made in the day time day coaches are requested and if these coaches contain end compartments, there are locked or distributed only to individuals securing special permission from my office. The coach next to the baggage car and as many others as are necessary are given to the University band and the band instruments are stored in one end of the baggage car. A responsible man is stationed at all times in the baggage car and the band director or his assistants is in charge of his coaches. Two or more chaperones are provided by my office and the Dean of Women furnishes one woman and a nurse. Their expenses are divided between the athletic association and our offices. In addition to this the railroad officials are asked to provide special operatives, who are given instructions as to the university's desires in maintaining good conduct. The student manager is made to realize that he is in charge and responsible for the management of the train. He is given practical instructions as to what to do in certain cases and is made to understand that all the assistance necessary is ready for him. There are in most cases other university officials riding down on the train. All in this group cooperate and we have experienced little difficulty in handling our trains. The students are encouraged to have a good time. If they want to dance in the baggage car, the band furnishes the music.

We have given permission to run only one over-night train. In this instance chaperons were placed in every car, the men's cars and women's cars were separated and two operatives were stationed at the entrances where the two sections met. The conduct was so free from reproach that even the Chicago newspaper men who went along hoping to get some scandal came out on their return with articles that there was nothing to the published stories that college students held pajama parades down the aisles of the pullmans.

Our only regulation concerning driving to the out-of-town games in automobiles is one affecting the women. Chaperones acceptable to the Dean of Women's office are required for the girls driving in cars and the time of their departure and that of their return is checked. Women who go to out-of-town games by train or automobile are required to register at the Dean of Women's office. For the train trip they are given two passes, one of which is collected on the trip down, the other on the way back.

Practically the same system, I believe, is being used by Minnesota. There is one important addition, however, and that is that in addition to his control of the special train, Dean Nicholson has a man in charge on each of the other trains run independently by the railroad companies. He says: "In addition to the official road, usually the other roads will carry one or two or three sleepers for women students and possibly special trains for students themselves. In such cases we again place chaperones in each individual sleeper and I place a man in charge of the train. We have been criticised for this to some extent on account of

the expense but since starting it we have had no serious situation develop at any time. In general I believe the plan of regulating the special trains is a feasible one. There are however certain aspects of train management that come in for special consideration. One is that a university located in a metropolitan area has a large number of trains serving the community. Furthermore the metropolitan areas contain a large number of alumni of both institutions engaged in the game, and a large additional public interested in the contest. Hence there are so many trains that they simply can not all be watched or controlled. Consequently students who desire to go on unchaperoned trains can do so rather easily. My only reaction to this, besides shrugging the shoulders is that up to the present time at least, the majority of our students have preferred to ride together. They prefer each others company to that of outsiders. They have more fun together. Although I believe there will be evasions, the standards for the greatest part of the crowd can be readily maintained. Furthermore on the return trip if there is a mix up on the schedule many of the outsiders push their way on to the student special until these people nearly outnumber the students. Under such conditions effective regulation becomes impossible. Fortunately this condition has arisen once with us, and will arise only with the short distances. These conditions I believe, do not apply to universities located in small towns.

An entirely different type of regulatory approach is made by the University of Illinois. Here the control is exercised not over the special trains but over the automobile driving. It can materially eliminate the difficulty that many of us have by its regulations against automobiles. To my mind the universities maintaining regulations against automobiles receive considerable recompense for the arduous efforts exerted to maintain these regulations at the time of these out-of-town games. But for those of us who have no such regulation the problem is not so easy. The only weapon that I know of is propaganda. Propaganda for careful driving, for not attempting the long trips, for the values of making the trip by train e. g. greater number of people to be with, how much harder work it is to drive home after a hard day than it is to enjoy the cushions of a pullman, how you can be in on the parade and cheering when the destination is reached, etc. Direct appeals on the quiet to organization leaders have been of some help but I believe at the best this propaganda is only mildly successful. What else to do? I do not know. As far as the girls are concerned, I believe our system of registering gets good results for conduct in the cars enroute.

I know of no institution that is maintaining any extended plan for controlling the conduct of its students at the games, and after the games at the dances and public places. Of course the people who chaperone generally sit in the same sections as the students and much of the student conduct comes under their observation. Observation doesn't mean very much however, unless the chaperones happen to know the individual. After the games the entire crowd spreads and what happens depends entirely upon conditions in the university visited and upon the individual. The thought occurs to me however that we could do some-

thing that most of us are not at present doing. One is to have previously given the students some idea as to where they might go in case of rain, when a person is an utter stranger to a campus he can pass some very uncomfortable hours by not knowing where to go to rest or if wet, where to go to in order to dry his clothing before train time. If there is no obvious meeting place it possibly would be of some value to have previously published in your student paper the name and location of place for meeting after the game—even if it were nothing more than a hotel lobby.

The large city presents an especially grave problem in after the game conduct. I believe it is an even greater problem for students who come to the city occasionally than for those who attend the metropolitan universities. For the new man it begets the attitude of seeing the sights. It is not infrequent that in large cities after the football game it is the tradition for students of the visiting institution to congregate at a given place and indulge in a rather riotous and loose party. Supposedly it is a form of celebrating victory or assuaging defeat. What to do about some of these cases is not easy to answer, aside from taking action against the individual offenders when they are known.

Now I believe we have discussed in one way or another the various phases of this problem outlined in the beginning—all the phases except one, namely, what should our attitude be toward student migrations? But before we discuss the question there are certain pertinent remarks to be made. One is that in dealing with student migrations we are really dealing with just one sport—football. That the problems of behavior during these migrations are in part at least projected by a highly emotionalized game in which the student is to a considerable extent influenced by what he thinks to be the right thing in school spirit. It is coached into him even as far back as his high school years. The team is the institution. When the team goes down to defeat the institution goes down to defeat. When the team is victorious the school stands high. When it experiences a bad season the students and alumni—yes and even at times the faculty—hang their heads—inferiors. And don't think that the high school students—prospective college timber, don't know. As far as I can find, school spirit was discovered and developed through contests, particularly athletic contests. I know of no attempts, consciously made by our universities to build up group morale. It is not strange then that concepts of what morale or spirit is are based on ones conduct in regard to the athletic contests. And what a curious code has been developed. Everyone must go to the game—even the out-of-town games. What games—well mainly football. The argument that is used so forcefully in the fall weakens with other sports in the spring. No one notices whether you go to the out-of-town baseball games—would give you a quick second glance if you told them you did. In fact in some contests—athletic or otherwise—you can even cut the home contests. But more than attendance is necessary at the football game. You must yell and get yourself frantic. The fellow has the most school spirit, who yells the loudest and goes the craziest. The fellow who doesn't yell doesn't have any school spirit. And after the game, cele-

bate victory or nurse your sorrow—even drown it! And to apply the point, when one gets away from home and steadying influence and eyes of observation, the idea of celebrate can take on tremendous proportions. The fault lies not alone in the out-of-town situation but in the teachings at home.

We all recognize the need and value of group morale. But now that the need and value is recognized, we must refine the concepts upon which it is based. School spirit should not be football spirit but university spirit. School spirit is love of Alma Mater in all her activities, her pride in the quality of her manhood, one's willingness to uphold her standards, allegiance to her ideals. We sing in our university:

“Quaecumque sunt vera
Proba, justa, mera,”

“Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things.” (Phillipians 4:8) If a man catches the real spirit of his institution he knows what his conduct should be on the playing field, in the stands, or after the game—in town or out of town. No man with such a spirit would raise in a brothel an inebriated toast to his Alma Mater any more than in such a place and in such a condition would he toast his natural mother.

In dealing with the problem of conduct at the out-of-town game then, we are merely dealing with one phase of a larger situation—the psychological factor at present connected with intercollegiate athletics, particularly football. There is another consideration to hold in mind before discussing one's attitude toward the total question and that since part of the value of the trip is educational, has the educational and beneficial aspects of our out-of-town trips been emphasized. Certainly one way to lessen an over emphasis or a false emphasis is to place emphasis on desired values. Advance information on places of interest attractive entertainment in respectable places, good eating places with atmosphere and without gin, buildings of note could easily be secured from the visited school. There are many students who would appreciate such information, if given through the right channels, e. g. The Unions.

And finally the problem is not to be decided simply on the basis of its irritations. It is so easy to condemn, so easy to want to wipe out that which gives us irritation or difficulty. It is furthermore difficult to keep the submerged one tenth from being the sole cause of a lot of cramping regulations for the entire undergraduate body.

In conclusion then what shall our attitude be toward students attending the out-of-town games? I think the answer is more specific than general. How is your situation, is it out of control? Is it out of control after trying to keep it in control or without any attempt at keeping it in hand? How does the conduct of your students at the out-of-town games compare with that after home games? What is the situation with the rank and file of the students attending the out-of-town games? How is their conduct? What is the attitude and influence of your student leadership?

Answering the question in the specific, I have based my own atti-

tude toward the out-of-town game on these things. At the end of a semester including two out-of-town games, both of which were heavily attended there was considerable rise in men's scholarship. After the Indiana game during which it rained torrents, there was no appreciable increase in infirmary patients. The chaperones reported some cases from the special trains but the general spirit of the crowd was orderly. The students seemed to be having a good time but were cooperative and responded well to the student leadership. There were automobile accidents, and we intend to exert as much influence as possible against the motor trips. But the rank and file satisfied us that their conduct away from home was satisfactory.

The deans of men and their wives were entertained at a musical and tea by the Washington branch of the American Association of University Women at 4:30 P. M. at the Club House, 1634 I Street, N. W.

At 8:30 P. M. a reception was given to the members of the association by the president, trustees and faculties of the George Washington University at Corcoran Hall with a concert by the George Washington University Glee Club.

The Chairman: Following our schedule the next paper will be by Dean Doyle.

THE COLLEGIATE MYTH

Dean Doyle:

"See that guy with filthy cords?
That's collegiate.
See that girl with painted lips,
Sport-cut hair and slinky hips?
She's collegiate.
See these cut-down, noisy Fords?
They're collegiate.
See that couple petting there?
See that guy with greasy hair?
That's collegiate.
Anything that's new and strange
Always is collegiate.
If a thing is odd or queer,
In a mode that others fear,
You know it is collegiate."—Ex.

Thus sings the every-ready friend of college editors, the ubiquitous poet, "Exchange." His song, strangely enough recalls a popular song of my own youth, "He's a college boy, with his college walk and his college talk."

Is the American college student "collegiate"? Is the picture of him—or her—that has become familiar in humorous magazines, newspaper jokes, the vaudeville stage and the "movies" true to life? Is he extreme and extravagant in dress and conduct? Is he noticeably different from the college student of a generation ago and if so, in what respects?

These are some of the questions that grew out of a statement of mine before the Association of Deans and Advisers of Men in their annual meeting at the University of Colorado a year ago. It was this:

"One of the most difficult problems of college journalism is of course the so-called 'college comic,' which is sometimes the journalistic outlaw

of an otherwise respectable campus. It is my opinion that current misconceptions, both inside and outside of educational circles, with regard to the conduct and morals of college students are often primarily due to the impression given by a few so-called 'comics.' The emphasis upon alcohol and sex in would-be 'funny' magazines has done more to give decent college men and women a bad name than any other single factor. No one who is at all familiar with the fine boys and girls who constitute the great majority of our student bodies is willing to admit that the picture of them given by certain 'comics' has any substantial basis in fact. Whatever foundation may exist—if any really does exist—for the distorted and gross caricature of college life given by these 'comics' is undoubtedly due to attempts on the part of unthinking and immature students to be 'collegiate', as misguided readers of these publications sometimes conceive of the term. It is a pity that these 'comics' should ever be accepted as genuinely representative of college life, and doubly a pity that college students or officers themselves should ever so accept them."

In an effort to establish this thesis on the basis of opinion other than my own, I sent a questionnaire to some 400 college deans throughout the United States. The survey has aroused considerable interest not only among the recipients, but also among undergraduates and to a certain extent in the daily press.

I must confess that at certain moments in composing the letter of inquiry my tongue was in my cheek. Some of my questions were calculated to arouse emphatic if not intense and violent opposition, I felt sure, from anyone who really knew college men and women. And they did! These questions were the first alternatives in the following groups of questions:

1. (a) Is the "collegiate" of the humorous press and the vaudeville stage the typical student of your college? or

(b) Is he an exception in the personnel of your enrollment, and if so, what percentage of the total student body is like him?

2. (a) Is a slouchy appearance, as evidenced by garterless socks, rumpled shirt and collar, sloppy shoes and wrinkled suits of clothing, typical of your student body? or

(b) Is neatness in appearance, as evidenced by clean shaving, well shined shoes, starched linen, appropriate neckties of neat appearance and well-pressed suits of clothing, typical of your student body?

3. In the main, does the psychological attitude of your student body approve slouchy and careless habits of dress and conduct or neat habits of dress and courteous manners?

It will be noticed that the second alternatives in each case were in distinct contrast to the first; in general they represented approximately my own opinions. Not all of my correspondents appeared to have noticed that two alternatives were presented. In fact, some jumped to the conclusion that the overdrawn picture was the whole thing and—what is worse—that it represented the deluded ideas of a rather unobservant and unintelligent dean of men. It is apparent that one does not even have to be subtle to be too clever by half! Some said my communication was too obvious at the very moment that others were calling it too clever. As a matter of fact, there was nothing to differentiate it from dozens of other questionnaires except the fact that I enclosed a stamped envelope for reply.

I realize, however, that anyone who is guilty of a questionnaire nowadays is taking a chance—even if it is not a sex questionnaire! From

my own experience on the receiving end I am convinced that the sending of a questionnaire ought to be placed by law not among misdemeanors, but among high crimes, punishable by life imprisonment on the fourth offense. As the miscreant who attempts to soften the blow by anglicizing the hateful thing and calling it a "questionary," as a recent bombardment of the student body at one university was called in the press, such a person should be apprenticed to a Chicago beer baron and compelled to live—I use the term "live" in a relative sense—in Chicago instead of Florida. Seriously, however, I realize that anyone who sends out a questionnaire owes an apology to his victims and I take this opportunity solemnly to offer mine. *Mea culpa!*

A surprising thing is the goodwill shown by my victims. Of course those who did not approve simply ignored the questionnaire—and perhaps utilized the stamped envelope to send the monthly check to the gas company. Those who answered were uniformly personally kind and nearly all expressed approval of the undertaking. Newspaper comment did not always show such a clear understanding of what I was driving at. A few editorial writers thought I actually believed in the existence of such a person as the one described in the first alternatives of my questions and reprinted me gently for my credulity while others made merry over the very idea that there were any serious students—an additional demonstration of the fact that public opinion with regard to the college boy needs correction. I must confess, however, that my questionnaire, with all due respect to its recipients, was largely constructed with this in mind.

It is in the field of public opinion, in fact, that the survey appears to have been of greatest service. Indeed, that purpose was frankly stated in the introductory paragraphs of my letter, which read:

"I am sure that in common with me you have felt concern and sometimes chagrin over the mental picture of the 'collegiate' boy or girl which the general public has apparently created during recent years. I feel that this imaginary individual is by no means typical of the young college man or woman and that the continuation of his false existence lowers the dignity which should attach to college life and makes more distinct the day when student opinion in America will be worthy of attention from the people of the country. I also feel very strongly that the typical college man or woman is an entirely different sort of individual, whose true qualities should be known and appreciated.

"For the purpose of contributing something toward the correction of what I believe to be erroneous public opinion and the creation of correct opinion founded on facts, I am sending this letter to deans in a number of the leading colleges and universities throughout the country in order to get a consensus of fact and opinion which can be presented to the public."

There is evidence that the undertaking has focused attention on the subject and has aroused discussion both in the public press and in college circles. If the conclusions reached as a result of correspondence with a large number of college officials receive equal attention, they may give the coup de grace to the collegiate myth and allow college students to be judged, not as a class apart, but as the average young Americans that they are—a cross-section of our own civilization at the college age-level.

Of approximately 400 questionnaires sent out, approximately 300 were returned. These included answers in some cases by college presidents or officers other than deans of men or college deans. In some cases the questionnaire was returned with brief answers written in; in others the recipients were stirred to eloquence and wrote rather full and nearly always interesting discussions of the whole problem or of particular aspects of it. Owing to the varied nature of the responses, I have found it necessary to abandon any effort to arrange my replies statistically. Indeed, in a questionnaire constructed as this was, and necessarily relying as it does upon general observation and opinion rather than upon exact scientific measurement, a careful statistical digest would be difficult and might be rather uninteresting. I have therefore had to content myself with quoting representative replies under various heads and attempting to interpret the general trend of the opinions expressed.

One of the most interesting features of the undertaking has been the fact that in some cases recipients of the questionnaire have referred it to other officers or to friends for corroborative opinion. In some cases my inquiry was referred by college officers to student organizations and discussions of it were carried on in student publications. From these sources have come a number of interesting editorials and communications dealing with the "collegiate." Even hard-working editorial writers on daily papers, misled by the rather extreme picture of the "collegiate" presented by the first alternatives of my letter, took the trouble to set me right on the ground of my presumed ignorance of real conditions. All these materials have been valuable.

THE "COLLEGIATE" STUDENT RARE

Nearly all the answers indicated that the "collegiate" student is relatively not very numerous. The usual reply ranged from "non-existent" or "negligible" to " $\frac{1}{2}$ of one per cent." A few estimated that he constituted from one to five per cent of our college enrollment. Several went as high as "under ten per cent." In general it was evident that the "collegiate" is relatively rare.

THE COLLEGIATE A CARICATURE

There was substantial agreement that the "collegiate" was merely a caricature. I quote from representative replies:

"This is brief for I always 'flare up' when this type is assumed to be collegiate. Forty years in one institution leads me to be sure in my own mind that no other group of men and women, of similar size, coming from as heterogeneous homes, are as high-minded, clean, earnest and as eager for work. In every such group probably 2 or 3 per cent are vicious, another 5 to 7 per cent are weak and easily led, but the remaining 90 per cent make me look to the future with confidence. It will be safe in their hands. Our business as Deans is to weed out the vicious 2 or 3 per cent who are supposed to be representative."

Stanley Coulter, formerly Dean of Men, Purdue University.

"The student in the humorous press and on the vaudeville stage is not the real student any more than the mother-in-law in similar situations is the typical mother-in-law."

Thomas Arkle Clark, University of Illinois.

"Obviously the collegiate of the humorous press and the vaudeville stage is a caricature and is so intended."

W. G. Leutner, Western Reserve University.

"I believe that there has been a great deal of exaggeration in many of the statements regarding the undergraduate of today. In a community of more than three thousand undergraduates there is just as wide a diversity of type as there is in any large community whether connected with the college or not. This is especially true today when the undergraduates are more individualistic than they ever were before. I am not much concerned with regard to their presentation in the humorous press or on the vaudeville stage. Such presentation has always gained its point by exaggeration and I am inclined to think that it gets its impetus from the humorous papers edited by the boys themselves."

C. W. Mendell, Yale University.

"The spirit of your letter is certainly to be very much appreciated and I am heartily in accord with your feeling that much that is called 'collegiate' is imaginary."

Fraser Metzger, Rutgers University.

"He is exceptional. We have perhaps two or three per cent of our enrollment who think that what they read in 'College Humor' is standard for a real college man."

John D. Clark, University of New Mexico.

"I believe the humorous press and the vaudeville stage present caricatures of the college student rather than accurate sketches. To attract attention they pick out the ridiculous and exceptional. The so-called 'collegiate' student may comprise one or two per cent of the entire student group."

E. W. Chubb, Ohio University.

"I am inclined to think that the 'collegiate' referred to is more a state of mind than a reality. I can illustrate what I have in mind by going back a little with our history. Everybody knows that what was known as an engineer just after the Civil War now moves under the name of a foreman, and it may be a rather ordinary foreman at that. The old so-called 'engineer' in the course of time has gradually been replaced by the real college engineer. The old fellow has not lost ground of his own volition. There has been a fight all along. This same thing is taking place now in almost every field of activity and I sometimes wonder if the reaction in the other fields is not somewhat similar to that in the field of engineering. The old idea that the college man was lacking in common sense is not sustained at the present time by the facts, but it may be true that those who are gradually being forced to give way to the college man are the ones who are putting up the fight. I may not be right in this, but I may be."

J. E. Williams, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

SOURCES OF THE CARICATURE

The movies, comic publications and the press seem to be largely blamed for the caricature of the college student. Dean F. M. Erickson of Willamette University sends an article which he wrote for his alumni publication, extracts from which follow:

"Universities are not alone in observing freshman week. A national journal of humor likewise has its freshman week marked by a 'Freshman Number.' As in other numbers its cartoonists and quipsters resort to gross exaggeration to secure comic effect. Students' dress is depicted as of enormous proportions or shameless scantiness. In ways of the world the student is amazingly sophisticated or unsophisticated. Either will do provided only he is amazing. Interest in education or

even an understanding of what education means is conspicuously absent. Escape from work, participation in the gay life, are his only concern.

"It may be admitted that there is a grain of truth in the picture. Every university has in its student body a few persons of this sort and the best of students do participate in traditions which attract the attention of the passers-by who have no interest in the serious side of student life. Youth is a period characterized by extremes of emotion and conduct. A new exuberance of feeling and a surplus of energy are seeking release while yet the controls of life are but partially developed. Moreover this tendency which is present in the individual is intensified when several hundred youths are brought together apart from the normal restraints of home.

"But does the cartoonist know the student? By no means. Or if he does he grossly misrepresents him. He is playing up the student to an older generation which gets its ideas of student life from its more spectacular demonstrations."

Other replies are:

"I believe that a small proportion of our students try to follow the type set for them by the 'collegiate' of the humorists and publicists. The latter, of course, know little or nothing about real collegiate types, as evidenced by their erroneous depictions. Those college students who try to live up to the public caricature of the 'collegiate' do so to their own disadvantage and discredit on their own campus."

Chester L. Rich, Dakota Wesleyan University.

"Were I not so rushed for time, I should take considerable space in outlining exactly my attitude on the university and college student of today, for I feel that he has been very much misused by such publicity mediums as the motion picture, the public press, and to a lesser degree by the radio and a gossiping, whispering, uniformed public."

T. J. Thompson, University of Nebraska.

One dean sends a quotation from the *Wisconsin Alumni Magazine* as follows:

"College Humor is no longer to be leader and dictator of American collegiate wit, so far as the Western Association of College Comics is concerned. The editors and managers of these publications, in convention at the University of Washington, voted recently to break their contracts which give College Humor sole reprint rights.

"Our reason for breaking the contract," said Albert Salisbury, president of the association, "is that we feel that College Humor is painting a picture of flaming youth which is not real, and which gives the average reader a false idea of college life.

"The magazine takes all of the gin and sex jokes and plays them as representative college humor, with no mention of any other type."

There were several rather amusing replies in connection with this feature of the inquiry. One dean said that the collegiate type of student is usually the "parlor lizzard" type. Another said, "We have only two freaks on our campus." Still another said, "The 'collegiate' type is an exception in our enrollment. He forms practically a negligible percentage of our student body. I do not know whether I dare to compare the women with the men, but in my opinion the few we have are mostly among the women."

DO COLLEGE BOYS DRESS WELL?

Nearly all of the replies received answered the questions with regard to dress in the affirmative. The college student in general is apparently neatly, not extravagantly, dressed, with certain exceptions due to exceptional or local conditions. Nearly all the deans agree that in general college men do not approve of carelessness or slouchiness in

dress. A number point out that even boys who are extremely poor keep their clothes in good condition and strive to maintain a respectable appearance, as in the following replies:

"The students are not slouchy but wear as good as they can afford and keep them in good order. There are, of course, some sweaters worn on the campus. One or two boys who have to be very economical are still very neat in their dress and appearance."

J. Milton Vance, College of Wooster.

Another dean writes:

"The collegiate type which you describe is so slightly represented here that it would be impossible to answer this question. The boys that are not well dressed and well-looking here are usually poor boys who have very little money to spend on clothes. In many cases, however, even the poorest boys are neat and even attractive in dress and appearance."

Still other replies emphasize particular conditions. Students may dress in rough outside garments because those are the only ones which will stand the hard treatment of engineering, agricultural and laboratory work. There is a difference however between the deliberately sloppy dress of the would-be "collegiate" and the wearing of corduroy trousers, sweaters, etc., in institutions where that dress is traditional or in engineering and agricultural schools where it has very definite practical advantages. These institutions, however, indicate that students are physically clean and that at evening social affairs and on week-ends there is a distinct change. Students cannot be distinguished at such times from other neatly dressed young men.

"The boys of the University of Nevada dress in a slouchy manner and usually wear outside garments, such as cords and sweaters, which are not ordinarily clean, but they are clean-shaven and are very particular about cleanliness in every way except with regard to their sweaters or other clothing which is more or less class insignia."

Maxwell Adams, University of Nevada.

"Our students are the practical type and dress according to the activity in which they are engaged. When dressed for public occasions, they appear to be thoughtful of their dress and to be as neat and well groomed as is possible within their means."

H. W. Moody, Mississippi A. & M. College.

"We have a very large enrollment in the School of Geology. The boys who are in this department do a great deal of field work, since oil developments are within a few miles of Norman. These boys of necessity dress for field work nearly all the time. I feel sure that you know the type of man whom we call, in Oklahoma, an oil scout. He wears boots and khaki pants, and generally a heavy jacket, frequently a sort of leather coat. It is no uncommon sight to see dozens of young men on the campus dressed this way, not as a matter of choice but of necessity.

"Our School of Engineering is large. Consequently, boys who are doing field work, laboratory, and such kindred courses, are usually dressed for that. The dress of the engineer does not differ a great deal from that of the geology student.

"We have an enrollment of 1,270 in R. O. T. C. These boys of course on "army days dress in uniform and frequently on other days a number of boys may be seen in uniform. This, then, accounts for a common dress on the part of a large number of young men."

M. L. Wardell, University of Oklahoma.

"There is one differentiation in dress from the main student body

which I believe is peculiar to all colleges and that is that some certain group progressing toward some specific objective may at times undertake to dress in such a way as to accentuate their future field. I have in mind the engineer, the forester, or the miner. At times there will be a tendency among the whole group to dress, we will say, in corduroy with boots. The average will be represented here by cleanness and neatness in appearance, not by the bizarre. I might add that there has been action taken on the campus recently which I think will be of interest to you. The National Convention of College Humor magazines was held here while I was away. At that time there was a vote taken in their convention on this particular question and referring especially to 'College Humor.' It was voted that 'College Humor' did not properly represent the student body. There is a distinct move on now to separate the college humor papers from this publication. A local vote was taken on the campus within the last few days sponsored by our college humor magazine as to whether "College Humor," specifically, was a good advertising medium on the ground that it did not properly represent students as they are. I would not have you think from the above that our college humor magazine is an ideal one. It misrepresents college conditions and I believe all the college humor magazines do so, but it is a hopeful sign that they now are beginning to see the faults of the outside magazine and from that I hope may progress to where they may see their own faults."

Edward E. Nicholson, University of Minnesota.

In this connection the following press report from the University of Florida is of interest:

"Any one believing that all college students wear wide-bottomed trousers, patent leather shoes and other "collegiate" clothes, need only to visit the campus of the University of Florida.

"He will be more likely to find a group of serious young men in overalls. The students dress neatly and well when occasion demands it, but the average boy is too busy to be bothered by the extreme niceties of dress."

INFLUENCE OF WOMEN STUDENTS

Several replies indicate that the influence of women students is helpful in the case of co-educational institutions:

"We still have some garterless socks, etc., but since we have a high class of girls our 'co-eds' have much to do with demands for neatness of appearance."

Haughton K. Fox, Adrian College.

"In the first place, we represent a co-educational institution and I feel that dignity and courtesy as far as dress and manners are concerned are better exemplified in a co-educational institution than in a strictly men's institution."

MANNERS AND MORALS

With regard to the manners of students, in general the answers are favorable. Some of the deans complain mildly of student manners, and a few mention the not uncommon stampede into the dining-hall. As for their attitude towards moral and ethical questions, opinion was about evenly divided as to whether the attempt to be "collegiate" was involved in these questions or not. My own feeling is that there is no connection. The problems indicated exist elsewhere, and probably will always exist to some extent. In any event, the college student is not the drunken roisterer or libertine that the comics sometimes depict him.

The deans were substantially in agreement that the would-be "collegiate" did not have time to excel either in studies or in "student

activities." A number pointed out that students who were working their way through college had no time for anything but business, and that those who attempted to indulge in "collegiate" nonsense soon found themselves out of the institution. Some made it clear that the college student merely represents present-day American life, and that responsibility for the faults of college students in moral and ethical matters must be placed at the doors of those who have created our present civilization. Others declared that the older generation usually forgets the faults of its own youth in dealing with young people. In the words of a newspaper paragrapher, "It is strange that we fellows, who everyone thought were going to the dogs a few years ago, are now the very ones who think the young folks of today are going to the dogs." Or as a friend of mine once put it, "It isn't true that youth is in revolt simply because a few young people do revolting things!" One does not need to be a very profound student of history or literature to realize that since Juvenal's day, and before, people have been longing for "the good old days" and wondering "what the young people are coming to?" But somehow the younger generation has never gone completely to the dogs—just as "the good old days" never really existed, except in the golden, if hazy, memories of youth that Providence in its kindness has given us to solace our old and middle age.

Other replies bring out the important fact that there has been an enormous growth in enrollment in American colleges, which have about six times as many students as thirty years ago, or practically a million students among whom it is to be expected that there should be some misfits. Replies bearing on these points follow:

"It is said that youth has been ruined in the last ten years. If this is true, whom shall we blame? People were more conservative before than after the World War. At the close of the great conflict all America was instantaneously released from a four-year social 'grip.' They had been taught to save, to use sparingly, and this economical symbol beat itself into the social structure of our people. They were as conservative with moral values as with economic goods, and they were conserving for something of which they knew nothing. The sudden release came. America was wild in enthusiasms. These college boys of today were little folks then, but their characters were constructed and shaped upon the ideas accumulated by them through their growing years. What they are revealing today is an after-image of their conception of conduct, of waste, of extravagance exemplified in the generation under whose guidance they were to become men and women.

"I think we forget too early our boyhood experiences, and are prone to believe that our college days were perfect ones. Yet, do we not all remember our individual pranks and opinions in our college days, of which we probably would boast were we not ashamed of them?

John G. Holt, South Georgia A. & M. College.

"I have a suspicion that it is the 'smart' alumnus who boasted of his 'collegiateness' while in school that is publishing his 'smartness' since getting out. He never learned to do anything better. My own humble judgment is that our boys and girls here in Cotner College are actually better morally, intellectually, and spiritually than were their fathers or grandfathers. I belong, of course to their fathers' generation. My memories of 'them' and observations of 'now' give the present boys and girls the advantage in the comparison."

J. K. Shellenberger, Cotner University.

"There is a frivolous minority which does, I think, indulge in drinking, necking, neglect of class work and the like in a mistaken attempt to be 'collegiate.' It is this rather small minority that provides most of the troubles of the Dean of Men. They are the ones who get in disciplinary difficulty and into academic embarrassments as well.

"This 'collegiate type' of student, of course, does not excel in either scholastic standing or student activities. He is a side-line bystander in everything that is useful and seeks his satisfactions in dissipations and neglect of work.

"I am not in position to state whether this objectionably collegiate type is on the increase or not. There is always in every college a number of undesirables. The same thing was just as true twenty-five years ago as it is today. The numbers are larger now, but whether the proportion is greater, I can't say."

S. H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin.

"Too many are going to college who are mentally unfit to grasp what it is all about. Some of those become the 'collegiate' type."

W. V. Lovitt, Colorado College.

"If there is an increase it may be due to the increase in enrollment. I do not believe there has been an actual increase in the 'collegiate' type in our college."

L. I. Reed, Iowa State Teachers College.

STUDENTS, A CROSS-SECTION

That students are merely a cross-section of American civilization at the college age-level is shown by the following testimony:

"In my opinion, the collegiate type is diminishing. This sort of action is regarded on our campus as 'high school stuff.' I agree with you that in general our student bodies compare favorably with those of preceding generations. Composed as they are, in state universities at least, of a cross-section of the commonwealth, it would be a startling commentary on the morals of the state if they were not."

J. A. Park, Ohio State University.

"I am sure that the student body is composed of individuals who represent the best type of young people in our country and I have no sympathy with the efforts of some to make them out anything else. Our student body here in the main is serious-minded and is possessed of fine ideals, not perfect by any means, but if they were perfect there would be no need of our existing as an institution."

D. T. Schoonover, Marietta College.

In answer to the question, "Is there any connection, in your opinion, between the attempt to be 'collegiate' and such problems as drinking, 'necking,' neglect of class work, dishonesty in examinations, other ethical problems?":

"No more connection between these and being 'collegiate.' than between these and the general practice of young people today, non-collegians as well."

Karl T. Waugh, University of Southern California.

"The faults of students in college are those of their generation and are not different from those of young people in general."

Charles Puryear, A. & M. College of Texas.

Dean J. G. Eldridge, of the University of Idaho, agrees with Dr. Park. In answer to the question, "Is the 'collegiate' type diminishing or increasing?" he says:

"Certainly not increasing. I verily believe that to find the true 'collegiate' type, so called, in aim, dress, and manner, one must go to the high schools."

One of the most illuminating answers comes from an eminent leader in fraternity life in the United States, who says:

"My own impression is that Harold Teen and his 'collegiate' types belong to high schools today rather than to colleges."

Francis W. Shepardson, President of Beta Theta Pi.

COLLEGE STUDENTS HARD WORKING

The following extracts demonstrate an improvement in the attitude towards serious work:

"The present generation in reality works much harder than the early college generations, because the world demands better trained men and women. The present-day student is not opposed to showing his frivolities but he knows what he is after in the long run.

"Our percentage of men who complete their University courses is very noticeably growing larger. More men take graduate work, and there is an increasing number of men who graduate with definite fitness to undertake some worthwhile work."

George B. Culver, Stanford University.

"I am certain that the very great majority of our students are taking their university work with a reasonable degree of seriousness, that their ideals and standards of conduct are better than those of preceding generations, and that there never was a time when the undergraduates did as much work during their four years of college as they do at present."

Earl J. Miller, University of California at Los Angeles.

"It is my judgment after a great many years of experience that the young people composing our student body are as serious a group of people as can be found anywhere. Their ideals and standards of conduct compare favorably not only with those of preceding generations but also with any similar group of people gathered together anywhere. My judgment is that the young people in our colleges are typical of the best life of our nation. The fact that they are in college is an indication of higher ideals and more worthy aims than those of people generally."

Harry Kremers, Coe College.

"I agree wholly with your statement in paragraph seven as far as Antioch students are concerned. In fact I think the students whom we have with us are more earnest in purpose than many of the young people with whom I went to college."

O. F. Mathiasen, Antioch College.

"I have seen the standard of the college student rising gradually from year to year in habits of dress, manners, conduct and morals. Also in his attitude toward the more serious problems of life. He is modern, to be sure, and this very fact brings him into disfavor with those who are lagging behind."

W. A. Kline, Ursinus College.

"Shortly after the World War a wave of prosperity sent a flood of men and women into our colleges who didn't know what it was all about—no background, hence no purpose other than to breathe college atmosphere.

"Collegians have always had fads, but these philistines have pushed fads to the limit, distressing the student body and faculty alike much as King Eglon of Moab distressed the Israelites. Administrative officers are getting control of the situation by raising entrance barriers higher.

"The vast majority of collegians are going about their business much as always, doing a lot of worthwhile work.

"I like the new collegian better than the former one. He is more

of a man, more independent more disposed to question faculty authority. Indeed, he has in various ways put the faculty on the defensive. More power to him!

"Wherever rebellion has broken out, investigate the administration first. As for manners, and modes, it wouldn't be college life without them—and finally, the sooner we reach the state of mind that young men and women of college age are best left to control their own conduct the better for all concerned."

J. L. Richmond, University of Toledo.

"Eighty per cent of our students, so far as I can see, are serious-minded and are doing as much work as we ought to expect them to do. Fifteen per cent are getting by indifferently, and five per cent are pretty hopeless. I think, however, that in any business or activity you will find that these percentages are not exceeded. I doubt whether eighty per cent of our business or professional men are worth while, and I am sure that there is more than five per cent of them who are pretty close to worthless."

Thomas Arkle Clark, University of Illinois.

"Generally speaking, I am convinced that our students are better morally, socially, and scholastically than were the students two decades ago. They are more open and more frank about their doings than were their predecessors, but at heart they are as good or better."

Oscar A. Ullrich, Southwestern University.

"In conclusion and summing up might I express this opinion that if there ever was a collegiate type such as you mention it has practically passed away, at least, on this campus. Our student body is a reasonable cross-section of society. Our young men and women are serious-minded with high ideals and standards of conduct and I think that they compare more than favorably with those of preceding generations.

"I think our young men and young women are much more competent to solve the problems of life. They accept leadership and responsibility much more readily. They are doing larger things in a larger way. I marvel at their poise and self-possession and I am not at all alarmed for their future or for the future of the country that they will guide and direct."

Robert Rienow, State University of Iowa.

CONCLUSIONS

In attempting to sum up the results of the survey, I shall necessarily have to try to express a rather complicated situation within a reasonable compass. While we cannot give our student bodies an absolutely clean bill of health—which no one would be foolish enough to expect—at least we can say that only a small fraction of them are as bad as they are painted, sung, filmed, or otherwise commonly portrayed. Indeed we may go farther and say that in general they are probably much better than the students of our own day. In the words of Dean Thomas Arkle Clark: "There is less rowdyism, drunkenness, and shiftlessness in the students of today than in any other college generation with which I have been connected."

Most important of all, the present-day student seems to be developing in greater degree a real conception of why he is in college. When we consider the purpose for which educational institutions presumably exist, we find that almost everywhere serious study is on the increase in American colleges. Honor courses, the tutorial system, more general respect for scholastic attainment, are evidence of this improvement.

The old ideas about "a gentleman's mark," the old belief that the high-ranking student is not a success in after-life, are rapidly being dissipated.

As for "collegiatism," from the opinions of deans and others interested in education and particularly from the attitude of college students themselves, who use the word "collegiate" as a term of reproach, I have no hesitation in saying that "collegiatism" is a disease of the public mind, rather than of the undergraduate body. The problem is, therefore, to try to set public opinion right rather than to attempt to make over our students. Insofar as students are affected at all by the "collegiate" germ, it manifests itself in the desire to show that they are college students by some outward sign, rather than by waiting for actual performance to show the value of a college training. Speaking of the passing of the "collegiate," "The New Student" says:

"The reason why it is going is the reason why all fashions change. The hoi polloi, drug clerks and farm hands, have caught up with it. The next job for college men is to create a new fashion. Otherwise the four years would be wasted, and there would be no way to distinguish between those who have had the privilege of a college education and those who have not." Do not overlook the fine irony of that last sentence!

The period when a college education had a social significance in America has about reached its close. The social prestige of a college degree is no longer strong except in isolated instances. It ought not to be so anywhere in a democratic country, where the highest education is open to all who can profit by it. The college student must realize that merely going to college is not going to make him different from his brother who does not go to college. At the same time the public must realize that the college community is not set apart, but is an integral part of the large general citizenship. With the development of institutions in large cities and the large number of new colleges which are being established as part of city educational systems, there is no longer a sharp dividing line between "town" and "gown." The college community and the local community are one.

The most serious error in the public attitude towards the college boy, in my opinion, is that the public expects him to act in an irresponsible way. People are only too ready to accept the collegiate myth. They apparently like to read the headlines which magnify the escapades of college youths. They are only too willing to overlook faults in a college student which they would not overlook in others. Personally I believe that if a college student drives an auto while under the influence of liquor with fatal results to others, he should be sent to jail and when he gets out never permitted to drive a car again. If a college student publishes an obscene or libelous publication he should be punished like any other offender against public decency and law. The indulgent attitude represented by the remark, "He is just a college boy" is one of the primary causes of the "collegiate" nonsense. When a bank clerk goes wrong we don't say "He is just a bank clerk," and forgive him; yet the bank clerk is often of equal age and exactly similar environment and antecedents as the college boy.

On the other hand, the college connection should not be stressed when it has nothing to do with the case. We sometimes see in the headlines "Drunken college boy arrested as hit-and-run driver" but we never see "drunken realtor." A drunken business man is just "a drunken man." Because a wild young girl once attended college we hear all about "co-ed bandits," but we rarely hear about "stenographer bandits." I believe that this is largely due to the heightened interest in everything pertaining to education and especially to higher education. Educational work is surrounded by an atmosphere of high standing, possibly due to the early and in some cases continuing close relations with religion. A much higher moral standard is demanded in educational circles than in society in general. The moral lapses of college professors are played up even more than those of Sunday School superintendents. Not long ago one educator was reported as having been dismissed because he divorced his wife on moral grounds, although he was the innocent party. We probably could not change this public attitude towards education, even if it were desirable. We must accept the moral responsibility involved. One aspect of this responsibility, however, is to see that our college students are neither misrepresented nor misled by an entirely false conception of college life hawked about by people who know little or nothing of the real significance of higher education.

More competent observers than I agree that the younger generation is sound at heart. Even when they make fools of themselves, one cannot escape the feeling that they are doing so in part simply to live up to the fool notions of them that their elders and the public at large apparently have conceived.

With all their faults and all their virtues, our young people represent, in the last analysis, the homes from which they come. They are a reasonably faithful representation of the civilization that their elders have created, the product of the social and ethical environment with which those who are supposed to love them best have surrounded them. If the product is a bad one, let us put the blame where it belongs—on those who have produced it.

"By their fruits ye shall know them"—not primarily by their buds or their blossoms. We are bound to do our best to see that bud and blossom are properly protected, but we must always bear in mind that it is the fruits for which we are working and the fruits by which our students and we ourselves will finally be judged. Let us hope that we may have wisdom to see what is fundamental and real beneath the transitory externals, and faith to go forward with confidence in the essential goodness and worth of the human raw materials with which we are privileged to work.

SIXTH SESSION

Saturday, April 13, 1929, 9:30 A. M. Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The Chairman: Professor Dawson, who has been our very efficient secretary, told me early in the year that if we could get Chancellor Lindley on our program we would be very fortunate, and through

Professor Dawson we have Chancellor Lindley with us and he will speak on "Student Group Life."

Chancellor Lindley: I recall a story of Alexander Pope. I think he had curvature of the spine. Some inquisitive youth raised the question as to who was this man Alexander Pope, and the reply was "A little crooked thing that asks a question."

I assure you that before I get through this talk I will be asking questions as Alexander Pope asked them. It is a great privilege to meet with you. "We Presidents," Dr. Thompson of Ohio once said, "grow progressively illiterate. We spend our time running errands and develop a certain aloofness to intelligence." In order to make good the inability of the faculty to deal adequately with student life, which is the central thing, we create a dean of men to help students and advise them. The dean exists just for the same reason probably that the Salvation Army exists, because the institution of the church has failed to reach the spot. I hope you will not resent that comparison with the Salvation Army, but I think the organization of American colleges and universities is an interesting commentary on the difficulty of keeping an institution true to its aim.

We have insisted at the college that certain undergraduate years exist primarily for the student, yet when we make our annual budgets we discover that that objective is sometimes lost sight of. The college exists, in some cases, for the faculty and certain highly specialized subjects. The attempt to get the college back to its objective is your job and ours. It is a long, long trail if I may presume to say so, and we don't well know how to go about it. We are enveloped by a good deal of fog: the fog of failing to know sufficiently in detail about the motivation of youth.

I can remember in my short lifetime the very beginning of the wide study of adolescence. I happened to sit at the feet of Stanley Hall at the beginning of his epoch-making studies which revolutionized secondary education and modified college education.

We don't know very much about youth, I think that we will confess that to ourselves. And so, when we think of the objective of the college, namely: to serve youth, we realize that we need very much more knowledge of youth than we now have.

We are now in the midst of a shift of standards called moral standards, and the testimony of the teacher, the police court, the social worker, and occasional press dispatches from Chicago, suggest that the moral situation is not what it ought to be. We have the problem of deciding whether there is a complete collapse of the moral standards that have motivated our race, whether the idealism of the world is dead, or on the other hand whether the plant is being shut down to get ready to make a new type of car. If the latter it is an expensive shut-down.

Some of us are hopeful enough to believe that our youth is on the way to better standards. They have repudiated the legalistic and censorious standards of the Puritan ancestors, and maybe they are on their way to better values. But however that may be, we know some

of the causes that have led to this change although we know them only superficially.

The cause usually assigned to the moral disruption in our society among the young and old is always the Great War. The Great War is blamed for everything. And undoubtedly that tremendous upheaval of habits and breaking of old ties and restraints had a great deal to do with speeding up the rate of the moral change. In addition to the war, the growth of knowledge, the terrific increase of knowledge which penetrates forbidden fields quite persistently, has come. I think you recall the little poem of the Bishop of Ely. He was commenting on English girls and their frankness in dress the candor generally of girls of our generation. You remember the little poem, of the Bishop of Ely:

"Mary had a little skirt
So neat, so light, so airy,
It never showed a speck of dirt,
But it surely did show Mary."

But there is a wholesomeness, in the cases of many of these fine young women, and a moral fastidiousness just as marked as in their mothers.

There is undoubtedly growth of knowledge and a removal of ancient inhibitions. We are quite sure that some inhibitions have been lifted. Some think they have all gone, never to return, but no one can be sure.

In addition to the growth of knowledge has come a spread of democratic ideas, the notion that individuality, and personality has its claims, however humble, that an inferiority complex is passe and to be despised, and that every individual is as good as anybody else.

But beyond the war, beyond the spread of the democratic ideas, is the ancient feud of youth and age. I remember a wise old man of the twelfth century wrote: "We can't sing their songs and dance their dances, we cannot understand the language of our children." Each generation has had different standards from those of their elders. You recall the story of the father and his son. The father kept very close to his son, as he thought. He said, "You must recognize that there is a wall between you and me. I clambered over that wall and can never go back. I cannot place myself in your place and I wish you to remember that." Youth is the time of action and experience, and age is the time of reflection and regret.

Up to twenty-five years ago youth in nearly all the colleges in the world was dominated strictly by the adult standard, and today youth is in revolt. They have a right to break with that standard. It is not for them, it is a standard peculiar to mature years. We must help our sons and daughters to standards suitable to their period of life.

We know now from the study of adolescence that the only way out of adolescence into maturity in its fullness is that adolescence shall be lived out fully. The way to get rid of the tadpole is not to cut off the tail but to leave the tail and feed the tadpole, and the frog will emerge. That is our job, to understand adolescence and see to it that a standard for youth which is different from the standard of their elders, shall be established, which will be wholesome, which will result in the fulfill-

ment of life, with the restraints that come with reasonable liberty. Our young people find that they cannot discover through the authority of dogma, they have got to discover the way of life through the authority of experience. Have we not taught them that the one essential of a liberal education is that they shall be masters of the scientific method, and what is more important, they shall be possessors always of the scientific spirit, which is a very much more difficult thing. They are beginning to take that rather literally and try anything once. However we should let them know a little in advance, that it is all right to have a good accelerator on the car but also brakes, and a good steering wheel.

I remember a little while ago picking up a road map, getting ready for a trip. "That's out of date," somebody said. A new road map was found, and it was a new picture and lead to a new itinerary. Here are young people in charge of power beyond any generation, each one of them seated at the wheel of a thirty horse power car. Remember that a human being is only one sixth of a horse power. One thus multiplies himself 180 times. That is all right if these young people or their elders who sit at the wheel are sober and know where they are going. We are perfectly willing for them to have a fifty horse power car if they can guarantee safety for themselves and others. After all it is a good deal better to have a car driven by the accelerator than by the brakes.

I will not weary you with these questions that are familiar to you. I mention them in order to point out the tremendous ignorance we have of the human material with which we deal.

Thirty years ago marks the time when the intensive study of youth was begun scientifically. Education is not suppression. Our job is not to repress the instincts of social and political activity, but to give them the right direction. And nobody has done more than this group to help youth discover ways in which these fundamental instincts may find proper expression in their lives. We can remember very well that once discipline in American colleges was a terrific problem because there was very little outlet. You know too how the curve of misdemeanors fell about as rapidly as the curve of athletics rose. We know that the only way to handle the situation is to give them something positive which satisfies these fundamental instincts, because we cannot change their instincts.

Now with these things in mind, the National Association of State Universities appointed a permanent committee on student life and activities, and we are hoping to get the cooperation of those intimately in contact with undergraduate life. We want to make this a constructive study. We have already established contracts with the Interfraternity Conference. We hope to enlist each fraternity secretary in some of the problems. We want knowledge, we want cooperation and a means of making club life more effective than it is now. I venture to take your time this morning to state to you the problem that we have and send out a Macedonian call for help: We are curious about the facts and certainly would like to have a more exhaustive inquiry. I don't know how to get it. As chairman of the committee I feel at a

loss to know how to approach some of these questions. I shall read the outline. I hope it will arouse some suggestions in your minds.

(Chancellor Lindley reads Outline)

There are several approaches to this problem. The university might conduct an intensive study of the situation on its own campus. Many of you have done that. Several universities might work jointly, or employ a man to make the study. Our National Association itself might study it. We have discussed the question of funds and think it would be quite practicable if a method were agreed upon. These are our problems. We have already had some contact with the Interfraternity Conference and have their promise of a very cordial cooperation with us.

I would like very much to have your counsel and of course your cooperation. This study, or one like it, cannot get far without you. As I said at the outset, it remains, I think, for the next few years to determine whether the American college and university will continue to enjoy prestige that it now enjoys. I am not at all confident that prosperity and influence is to remain on its present plane unless we have an even better understanding of youth than we now have.

That is to say, the future of higher education in this country is not at all secure, speaking relatively, and it will turn on our success in converging every agency of the college and university, not to the improvement of the lot of the faculty as an independent affair, but of youth, this great stream of youth that comes up to us, hoping and expecting, and for whom their families make an incredible sacrifice.

Dean Goodnight: I don't wish to discuss, but the subject of a study along these lines seems to have been anticipated by the Land Grant Colleges in a request to the Commissioner of Education for a survey of the Land Grant institutions. We have with us, Dean Massey who is Chairman of the section of Student Welfare which has sent out a two thousand page questionnaire that covers the field entirely.

Dean Massey: I have nothing to discuss. I just want to say with reference to the announcement of that two thousand page questionnaire that a friend of mine, a Methodist layman, knew that a Methodist preacher could not lie, but was quite sure that the rest of them could. A man said that his preacher was the darndest liar that ever lived. He replied that he was no liar, "just an imagining mind." Dean Goodnight is here this morning.

That questionnaire on Student Relations and Welfare has 160 pages. Dr. Greenleaf at my left here is working on it now. He will continue working on it, getting information together. They will be out, I think, a year from July.

Dr. Greenleaf: I am a bit afraid that times will change so rapidly that you will not be interested in the information that has been gathered in that questionnaire. But I hope that we may be. That is about all I have to say about that two thousand page questionnaire.

Dean Massey: I am not given much to publicity and I don't want this question in the newspapers. It is with reference to the Jewish

problem. One Southern institute has 350 Jews from New York alone. Now what are we going to do for that group in the organization? Some of them are not admitting them into the Interfraternity Council. One group said to me recently, "Why, we can't let them go into that scholarship group, winning our scholarship prizes, they will win them every time." They might, I don't know. Do you admit into the fraternity councils of your institute, everybody? May I ask how many admit locals as well as nationals?

Dean Heckel: We have the associate members who are non-voters. I might say that in two of the past four years we have had Jewish presidents of the Pan-Hellenic Council, which fact does not indicate a prejudice against Jews.

Dean Massey: I think that Land Grant College questionnaire will be of tremendous assistance especially that two thousand pages on student Relations and Welfare. Maybe Dr. Greenleaf has something to say about what he is finding out.

Dr. Greenleaf: The questionnaire on Student Relations and Welfare contains 160 pages divided into seventeen sections on various phases of welfare. It is not quite time to tell you the results of this investigation, but one institution reported that the questionnaire went through two hundred different hands for answer. The method that we are proposing to use is to edit the returns, tabulate them on large sheets, and see what we get afterwards. We will then write up two separate reports, one for popular reading, and one a statistical summary of the whole.

Another part of the general survey which I think you will find interesting is the questionnaire to graduates and ex-students of the Land-Grant colleges and universities. Some forty thousand returns from these alumni are now on file in the Bureau. These are being tabulated on the Hollerith machine, and results are expected to show the history, occupations, earnings, accomplishments, and attainments of the former students after leaving college.

Dean Stone: I want to say in reply to your questionnaire on Welfare, that if we got nothing else but the benefit which came from filling out this questionnaire, it would be well worth the time that it took. I felt that it was provocative of thought and also of humility. There were so many things that we were not doing. I am wondering if there were others who wondered why they had to leave so many spaces vacant.

Chancellor Lindley: I would like to know who these people are that answered these questions. A football coach does not know certain irregularities in his team until the time the season is over, he is the last man that hears about them, and certain administrative officers are the last people in the world who know the failings of their system.

I fell in with a newspaper man who was on the campus, a wise young man, level headed and very honest, and what he told me made me sit up. I verified what he said and I found out that the world was wrong and he was right.

Dean Coulter: I have known institutions where the presidents.

have refused to permit answers to any questionnaire go out, without their approval.

Chancellor Lindley: I am not sure, I think it might happen.

Dean Coulter: I think it would make the value of the questionnaire very doubtful if you accept only answers approved by the president. The question in my mind is whether after all, it is not a hopeless problem that we are attempting. I think perhaps we could advise when we understand a little more fully the situation, but I rather imagine that the present generation of youth is going to have to work out its own salvation. My experiences have lead me to believe that about the most useless thing that a dean of men does is to give advice to a student. I think we have been wasting our time in telling students how to live. I think we are wasting our time in trying to tell the students how to adjust themselves to the times of which they are a part. As a matter of fact, the students are adjusting themselves to the age more than we are. A good many of our problems arise because of the fact of their more perfect adjustment to the world.

I have more confidence in youth, after some forty to fifty years in dealing with youth. I have more confidence in youth, in the power of youth, in the glamor of youth, than when I began to work, and I am tremendously certain that, inspite of the questionnaires, and in spite of the conferences, that youth is going to take care of the future, just as we ourselves have taken care of our own lives. They will live lives in honor just as we have tried to do. I am not at all certain as to whether or not, in this mechanistic age of ours, we haven't felt some of its influences. We have such an amazing release of power in our day that we have not yet been able mentally to grasp its suggestiveness.

Chancellor Lindley was right when he said that you can't change the morals of youth, and ever since youth has appeared in the world, every age has been a little better than the other age.

A long while ago, when I was in college, I heard of a book, the Origin of the Species, and I bought it. The faculty heard that I had it and I was called before that body. I was warned of the danger, told that it meant the destruction of all that was good and clean in the world, and finally, the faculty decided to impound the book until I graduated. They took the book, and the immediate result was that I bought another, I suppose they thought they had done their duty concerning my future, and I sometimes think that some of those opinions that we are trying to save youth from are very much like my experience with the Origin of the Species.

Let them live their own lives, strive in their own way, to suit their own age, regardless of us. Whatever we do the problems of youth will continue to vex the deans of future years.

The following paper was submitted by Dean Robert Rienow though it was impossible for him to deliver it in person:

In the post-war period of flux and change and almost world chaos, educational institutions and social organizations as well as the religious world, have become much concerned over problems emanating from what seems to be a readjustment of moral values, and a changed

attitude of the public towards the problems involved in conduct, and the disobedience of the individual to what has heretofore seemed to be well defined standards of life.

Perhaps no place is this problem more distinctly noticeable than in the effort of our colleges and universities to somewhat approximate a reasonable solution of the so-called problem of discipline. The term discipline carries with it the idea of punishment and the inflicting of penalties for the violation of regulations. Regulations in colleges and universities find their analogies in laws as enacted by the body politic. In the case of the latter, through the centuries, there has come up a well defined system of jurisprudence. Law making bodies have evolved out of arbitrary despotism. Courts have risen out of torture chambers and forced confessions. Juries have taken the place of superstition and a system of judges and officers have made it possible for men to live together in safety.

In our colleges and universities, however, we still find ourselves functioning in matters involving discipline, obedience, and conduct, under a system of worn out traditions, conventionalities, and an utterly chaotic institutional mind, on matters of conduct, regulation, penalties and punishment.

Under such concepts of discipline about the only recourse open to administrative officers has been seemingly simple one of suspension or expulsion from the student body. It has been used so much and for so many purposes that we have become quite hardened and we pronounce this penalty, feeling in nearly all instances, in our self-satisfied way, that it is utterly insufficient.

When educational institutions numbered their student bodies by scores or by a few hundred and when it was possible for the president or the dean of college to know every student personally and intimately, and to know their parents as well, when he had a fair notion of the social and religious and economic background of each individual, it was not difficult to bring considerable influence to bear, in a constructive way, upon the manners, morals, and conduct of the student, without actually severing his connections with the institution. Today when great universities and even some of our colleges count their students by the thousands, and when these students are recruited from every state in the Union and numerous foreign countries and from every social class, such intimacy, such knowledge, seems on the face of it to be impossible, and we have given ourselves up either to the hard and pessimistic policy of ruthless elimination, or to a careless and indifferent attitude of "laissez faire."

Within the last fifteen years, however, a new force has been developed within our institutions of higher learning. We find ourselves unable to accept, without question, principles of discipline, conduct, and behavior, that seem to have had their origin, very largely, in the continental universities. It seemed perfectly logical some twenty-five years ago, which time marks the beginning of the growth of our large universities, colleges and institutions of higher learning, that we should look to those organizations of longer standing and pattern, in many

respects, from their experiences. This was particularly true in regard to the attitude of the faculty and administrative officers towards what we might call student problems, conduct, behavior, discipline, and regulations. It was rather taken for granted that the intimate relations between administrative officers and faculties that obtained in the smaller institutions, was not only impossible in our rapidly growing universities and colleges, but strange to say, many absolutely believed that it was undesirable. Institutions of higher learning have steadily and consistently expressed the judgment that inasmuch as they are institutions of higher learning and inasmuch as they are supposed to deal with more or less mature minds that know what they want and why they come there, that such institutions are not concerned with problems involving discipline, conduct, and behavior. It is not unusual to hear a faculty man express the decided judgment that if a young man or woman does not know how to behave himself he should be sent home, that a university or college is not a reformatory, that instructors in academic work should not be bothered with problems involving conduct. It might be said that up to within the last ten or fifteen years this attitude on the part of university and college faculties was quite general. The university was there with its courses of study, its laboratories, its libraries and faculties. The student might come if he were competent to enter this institution and might enjoy its privileges provided he met the regulations established by various faculties. At any time that he stepped aside from the beaten path, expulsion from the institution was the penalty.

Of recent years, this policy has been severely questioned and criticized. Parents, taxpayers, citizens in general, are beginning to challenge our educational program. We are beginning to wonder, "What profiteth a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" In a larger way than ever before the nation is coming to look to its universities and colleges for the training of leadership, not alone in the fields of academic learning but in all fields and along all lines essential to good citizenship and the perpetuity of our government and civilization. We are beginning to understand as never before that intelligence alone cannot save a people, cannot perpetuate its institutions, cannot bring happiness nor everlasting prosperity.

Certainly, no nation in all the history of the world has so completely committed itself to a program of universal education as has these United States. Not only are our elementary and secondary schools flooded with students but in our institutions of higher learning, we are enrolling today nearly a million young men and women. The doors of opportunity are wide open regardless of wealth or poverty, class, sex, or color. Into this great educational program the people, through taxation and by individual endowment, are pouring millions upon millions. We are terribly in earnest and our faith in the efficiency of education is deeply seated.

Yet in spite of this wonderful program, a Committee of the American Bar Association, appointed to study existing conditions, recently reported, "That the criminal situation in the United States, so far as

crimes of violence are concerned, is worse than in any other civilized country." According to the figures given by Warden Lawes of Sing Sing Prison the average homicide rate from 1911 to 1921 for England and Wales was .76 per 100,000 of the population, for Canada .54, for Australia 1.88, for South Africa 1.79, for Holland .31, for Norway .82, for Switzerland .18, and for the United States in the registration area covered it was 7.2. More robberies and assaults with attempt to rob are committed in the city of Cleveland each year than in the whole of England, Scotland, and Wales. A recent investigation showed that during the year the number of automobiles stolen in Liverpool, one and one-half times the size of Cleveland, was 10; in London, ten times the size of Cleveland, 290; in Cleveland, it was 2,327.

The number of prisoners per 100,000 of the general population increased from 66.6 in 1923 to 84.1 in 1927 and it seems apparent that each year crime is eating deeper into our civilization. Francis B. Sayre, Professor of Law at Harvard University, in a recent article in the *Atlantic* makes this interesting comment on the above facts, "There is a popular tendency to dismiss all social responsibility by blaming the law and turning to the lawyers alone to work out much-needed reform. I suspect that our shortcomings in home training, in our schools, in our church, in our use of religion, have more to do with the increase of crime than the shortcomings of the law. Moral standards cannot possibly be created by law."

Certainly in the face of these astonishing facts and of this challenge it behooves us as educators and administrative officers in educational institutions to open our minds and make every effort possible to determine not to what extent education is responsible for these conditions but what we have omitted from our educational program that might seem to contribute to this unfortunate situation. In other words, an educational system so vast, so universal in extent, so expensive in upkeep and maintenance, certainly must make every effort possible to determine whether or not it has not something to contribute to our civilization, to our social and moral structure, that will make this old world not only a more luxurious and prosperous and richer world than it is, but finer, sweeter, cleaner, and happier.

I believe there was an old statement in physics to the effect that water would rise no higher than its source. Is it not likewise true, as we look back over the history of civilization, that the morals and conduct of a nation have risen no higher than that of its leaders? The history of the world is the history of the great men and women who have lived here and worked here. It will be hard to justify the expenditure of millions in our secondary and higher educational systems except upon the assumption that from this source shall come that leadership that shall guide and direct our people aright, a leadership that shall be interested not alone in furthering the advance of science, in the development of art and literature, and in furthering the prosperity and money-earning powers; but a leadership trained to wise judgments, clear distinctions between right and wrong, unfaltering courage, and an unselfish devotion to the interests of society.

This can only be done through methods developed to train judgment, to test courage, to measure conduct and behavior. To whatever extent then our universities and colleges can develop in their young men and women a sense of their responsibility and obligation in the development of such qualities, not only of mind but of heart and soul, that will send them out into their day and generation with a well-defined purpose of influencing the constructive thinking of the people along lines that will stimulate a respect for right conduct and behavior, a desire to see justice prevail, to that extent we are called upon to bend every energy, to use every method, and perhaps even to indulge in what some may call foolish experiments to bring about this end.

With this objective in view and granting that the universities and colleges are in a large measure responsible for the establishing and the developing of right ideals of living as well as the filling of the mind with general ideas, it is plain to see that our worn out system of traditional discipline, our enforcement of faculty made regulations, are futile. They are not constructive; they are not inspiring; they are not educational. They were never intended to be such. They are, and have been, a sort of a protective measure established by the faculties to maintain a decent awe and respect in the minds of the students and a fear of the consequences that might follow violation of the same. They are utterly antagonistic to our entire system of government. To whatever extent we are a democracy, our system has depended upon a participation of our people in the affairs of government, in the making and enforcing of laws and to whatever extent this present form of democracy has been a failure, it has been because of an effort to apply our regulations, our laws, and penal code, after a manner long since antiquated and useless.

Our most brilliant minds in the legal profession and on our judicial benches are admitting the failure of strictly legal methods to bring about desirable results. Professor Sayre further says in the article above quoted, "For centuries we have assumed that crime is the voluntary choice of a free agent and that it will somehow benefit society to punish the criminal; and our punitive or retributive theory is not preventing crime or saving those convicted from criminal careers. Modern criminologists are finding that over one half of our prison population are recidivists, men who have been convicted before. The venerable retributive theory, blue-blooded, sanctified by the ages, has gone down under the fire of modern criticism and scientific investigation. Yet upon this retributive theory is based the penal code of nearly every American state. In place of the barren aim of punishment or expiation, modern scientific thought has sought more practical ways of conserving the social welfare and, as the bedrock objectives of criminal justice has concentrated upon the reformation wherever possible of the individual offender, the prevention of further crime on his part and the deterrence of others from imitating the offence. This means the intensely practical problem of securing results in human conduct, a problem which the mere abstractions of penal codes will not solve. The task is not to fit the penal treatment to an abstract crime, but to a concrete

criminal—to discover some method of social treatment which will register results in the consciousness of the offender himself. To attain such an objective, mass treatment is evidently futile. What proves immensely effective with one will be utterly unavailing with another. Individualization of treatment is the only way. From this there can be no escape.”

I have quoted to some length from this intensely interesting and practical viewpoint of a lawyer because it is quite evident that his thinking and the thinking of many of his colleagues similarly minded, has far outreached the conception of discipline in most of our universities and colleges where of all places we should look for leadership in the most effective and productive lines of social reconstruction. May it be further said that this quotation is used with absolutely no idea of assuming the criminal tendency on the part of college and university students nor is it to be assumed that we are dealing with criminals through our rules and regulations although we as administrative officers are frequently compelled to admit that the criminally minded is not an unknown quantity in the student body.

With this background in mind it seems clear that our reasoning will but bring this conclusion, namely, that our educational institutions have not in the past given sufficient emphasis to the important and valuable objectives of self-government and discipline and in supplying ideals that will motivate when applied in the actual experiences of life. Perhaps this has not been sufficiently stressed because of its spiritual and intangible character or because of the seeming impossibility of giving it a concrete place in our administration. We have become so used to measuring the value of a college education in grades, in lectures listened to, and in examinations passed, that we have frequently forgotten that some of the most essential values of education and training are not tested after this manner. We are beginning to realize, however, in a larger and larger way that in addition to academic excellence, professional skill, and the ability to make money, the value of a college education lies as much in the development of personality, right ideals and habits of living, and a sane and philosophical outlook upon life, and a clear concept of right conduct and right behavior.

It therefore behooves us to direct our attention to the methods that may be used in our colleges and universities whereby we may approach something of concreteness in the development of these desirable qualities. In the first place, we are quite certain, those of us who are intimately associated with administrative duties, that our methods heretofore used, like those in vogue in the legal world, can be vastly improved. Secondly, it is not difficult to understand that modern youth with his larger sense of freedom, his more intimate contacts with the world, his more precocious outlook on life, does not take kindly to the subservient attitude towards faculty made regulations of past generations. He is frequently inclined to question the necessity for certain regulations and in many instances the real justice of the same. Not having had any part in their formulation, he loses interest in their enforcement. He finds little or no relation between these regulations and his own happiness, success, or

life interests. Not having been consulted he lacks that sense of ownership and proprietorship that comes to the individual or group who are interested in working out their own problems.

We are all more or less familiar with the usual methods of formulating regulations and enforcing the same in college communities. Some member of the faculty perhaps or some administrative committee becomes possessed of the notion that a certain activity is bad, that students should not do certain things. This viewpoint is presented to a committee and no doubt is argued pro and con with considerable vigor, depending upon the seeming seriousness of the regulation, and it is finally decided by this committee that a certain regulation should be formulated and it is passed on to the faculty or the board of directors or the administrative committee for its sanction and promulgation. In all this procedure, the student mind was never consulted. True, many members on the faculty insisted that they knew the student mind, that they had talked with students, but experience has taught us that this Proxy method in arriving at student judgment is a rather dangerous procedure. In due time this regulation is promulgated and we are now ready for its enforcement. The student body views it as simply another arbitrary restriction. Quite possible the purpose to be achieved was an excellent one. Quite possible the thing which this regulation attempted to check should have been eliminated. The point to bear in mind is that the whole procedure omitted the most valuable party to the contract and the very method by which this regulation was promulgated aroused if not actual antagonism, at least supreme indifference on the part of the students who were supposed to obey.

The problem before college administrative officers then seems to be one of how best we can secure the sincere, enthusiastic cooperation of the student body in the establishing of a code of conduct, proper restrictions and regulations that shall appeal to them as being absolutely necessary not only for successful community living on their part, but as necessary to developing in them those qualities of leadership which shall make it possible not only to guide their own conduct and behavior in the business and professional world but to aid in interpreting the spirit of our day and generation and in leading community thought in the right direction. Such a constructive program assumes that in the largest and finest sense a university or college is a reformatory. It assumes that the four years of college life are not exactly a holiday excursion, a little side issue, but are in truth and in fact a real and integral part of life itself. A college education does, if it means anything at all, mean reformed ideas of life. Our work would indeed be a failure if the men and women who leave our college campuses are not more intelligent, more thoughtful, better trained, and with a larger capacity for self-help and better able to contribute to the interest and prosperity of the world. Is it not then just as essential that somewhere in this college life there should also be developed, where necessary, reformed notions of the ideals of life, of conduct, of behavior, and of self discipline?

Concrete and satisfactory results along these lines are not as intangible and omniscient and impractical as may appear on the surface. A large part of our failure in the past to secure results we so much desire has been due to our refusal or our inability to incorporate the student body and the various student groups into the administrative machinery of the institutions. As pointed out previously, our attitude has been entirely too arbitrary or too indifferent. The results in one case leading to deception, subterfuge, and at times rebellion, and in the other case leading to chaos and dissipation.

In approaching the solution of this problem, we are compelled to assume that we are dealing with reasonably minded men and women, a large proportion of them over legal age: many of those under legal age, more mentally mature than many of our older citizens in the body politic. A recent writer has stated that the average mental age of the people of this nation, measured by tests, would probably be between fourteen and fifteen years. We are dealing with a very splendid group of intelligent young men and women. Our secondary school training, in spite of frequent criticisms of the same, is on the whole excellent. They come from the best homes of the nation. They are stimulated by the highest ideals of life, some with very definite purposes and others with purposes rather vague, they come to college with the firm conviction that it is the right thing for them to do and that somehow or other when they place themselves in our care they are to be greatly benefited. Certainly one could not ask for more desirable material to work upon and to work with than the students in our colleges and universities of the present day. They are ready to cooperate to the fullest extent to just the degree that we will extend the opportunity to them to do so.

But the problem of developing self control, individuality and judgment among student groups and with individuals carries with it the privilege on their part, if I might call it such, to make mistakes. In fact, I am not sure but what we all have learned as much through our mistakes as through any other of life's discipline. But the making of mistakes carries with it, of course, the opportunity to rectify such mistakes, to correct habits of living and habits of thinking and to improve day by day and year by year during the college period in the development of judgment and worth and self direction.

We would not be foolish enough to turn this whole machinery without guidance or direction into the hands of the students themselves. This is perhaps the point where our so-called self-government policies and student council organizations in colleges and universities have failed. The problem of self direction and self control and the development of judgment calls for a very close and systematic relation between faculty and administrative bodies and student organizations and individuals. In the working out of this problem, student bodies have been perhaps even more unreasonable and arbitrary than have faculties and administrative officers. They have frequently assumed that the presence of faculty men upon joint committees or boards of administration meant arbitrary faculty domination. Perhaps tradi-

tion has made this a natural consequence of the past lack of understanding and sympathetic cooperation between faculty and student groups. But on the other hand, it has been also due to the feeling on the part of faculty and administrative officers that student opinion had no place in the administration of a university or college. Faculties have been jealous of their prerogatives and of their authority. Here again tradition and the age old conventionalities have hampered our growth. If the so-called "revolt of youth" has done nothing else, it has perhaps had a tendency to destroy some of the conceit of the past generation. Our friend, Booth Tarkington, intimates that we are not quite so certain of our wisdom and our judgment and our omnipotence in the face of the crashing frankness and fearlessness and the adventurous spirit of modern youth.

Does it not behoove us then to join with these young people on our college campuses with a healthy, sympathetic understanding spirit of cooperation, to work out problems of administration, that shall develop in them these higher qualities of leadership which, I am sure, they themselves feel a large need of? Now this policy does not by any means smack of softness, of indifference, of maudlin sentimentality. It does not mean the breaking down of discipline. It means the shifting of emphasis. The easiest kind of discipline to enforce is the arbitrary discipline of regulations, faculty made and faculty administered. It is the easiest thing in the world to convict the guilty student and send him home. The ease with which this kind of discipline has been administered has perhaps been one of the reasons for its continuance. This is one of the difficulties in many homes in the training of children. It is so much easier for the father or the mother to do the thing themselves than to train and to preserve in order to teach the child to do that, to put up with his mistakes and shortcomings, knowing that through them, these mistakes, he finds his way to clearer vision and better living. It is not an easy thing for faculties and administrative officers to concede the right place of student judgment in administrative affairs. It is more or less difficult to find a sufficient number of men and women with the right spirit and the right attitude and ability to understand the student mind and to cooperate with them to the fullest extent. Yet this must be done if our universities are to serve the state in their highest capacity.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The Committee on Nominations consisting of Deans Goodnight, Clark and Melcher, placed in nomination the following members: For President, Dean J. W. Armstrong of Northwestern University; for Vice-President, Dean G. E. Ripley of the University of Arkansas; for Secretary-Treasurer, Dean V. I. Moore of the University of Texas. The association, acting on the report of the committee, unanimously elected these officers.

The Committee on Time and Place of Meeting consisting of Deans Moore, Cloyd and Armstrong, recommended that the next meeting be held at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, in the month of April. This report was also unanimously adopted.

The Committee on Resolutions consisting of Dean Brandon reported as follows:

The Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, at the close of a most pleasant and profitable meeting, expresses its sincere appreciation of the services of its officers, and expresses sincere regret in the loss of an efficient secretary and a valuable fellow-worker in Professor F. M. Dawson. The association proffers its heartfelt thanks to George Washington University for the hospitality and many courtesies so generously extended to the association and its members.

It thanks in particular the Theta Delta Chi fraternity and the Association of University Women for their gracious hospitality and last of all but in an especial sense Dean H. G. Doyle, who has not spared himself to contribute to the comfort and pleasure of the members. He will always be remembered by the association as a wonderful host. To him the association proffers its congratulations for his skill in planning and directing the social and recreational program, and expresses its gratitude for all he has done in making our stay in the national capitol an occasion never to be forgotten.

Committee on Resolutions,

E. E. Brandon, Chairman.

In the later business session proposals to consider meeting with other organizations were rejected as was the suggestion that this body associate itself with other existing associations.

With a few words from the incoming President the final session was adjourned.

APPENDIX

- A. Roster of those in attendance.**
- B. Summary of previous meetings.**
- C. Minutes of Annual Meeting of Deans of Men of Eastern Colleges.**

APPENDIX A

Name and Address	Title	Institution	Fraternity
Armstrong, J. W., Evanston, Ill.	Dean of Men	Northwestern	
Bennett, J. M., Springfield, Mo.	Dean of Men	Drury College	
Bosworth, E. F.	Dean of Men	Oberlin	
Bradshaw, F. F., Chapel Hill, N. C.	Dean of Men	U. of N. C.	
Brandon, E. E., Oxford, Ohio	Dean L. Arts	Miami Univ.	P. K. T.
Bryan, D. B., Wake Forest, N. C.	Dean L. Arts	Wake Forrest Col.	P. D. K.
Campbell, H. D., Lexington, Va.	Dean of University	Washington & Lee	A. T. O.
Clark, T. A., Urbana, Ill.	Dean of Men	U. of Ill.	A. T. O.
Clothier, R. C., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Pittsburgh	
Cloyd, E. L., Raleigh, N. C.	Dean of Students	N. C. State Col.	P. K. T.
Coulter, Stanley, Lafayette, Ind.	Dean of Men Emer.	Purdue Univ.	
Culver, G. B., Stanford, Cal.	Dean of Men	Stanford	D. U.
Detweiler, F. G., Granville, Ohio	Dean of Men	Denison Univ.	L. C. A.
Dirks, Louis H., Greencastle, Ind.	Dean of Men	Depauw	
Distler, T. A., New York City	Dir. Adm. and Pers.	New York Univ.	Z. Psi
Doyle, H. G., Washington, D. C.	Dean of Men	Geo. Wash. Univ.	
Duerr, Alvan E.	Interfraternity Council		D. T. D.
Duke, Victor L., Redlands, Calif.	President	Univ. of Redlands	
Dutton, G. E., Newark, Del.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Delaware	K. A.
Fisher, M. L., Lafayette, Ind.	Dean of Men	Purdue Univ.	S. P.
Gauss, C., Princeton, N. J.	Dean of Col., Arts	Princeton Univ.	
Gerstenberg, C. W.	Secretary	Interfraternity Council	
Gilbert, E. D., Defiance, Ohio	Dean of Men	Defiance College	P. G. M.
Goodnight, S. H., Madison, Wis.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Wis.	K. S.
Graham, Hugh, Urbana, Ill.		Univ. of Ill.	P. U.
Greber, M. E., Sioux City, Iowa	Dean of Men	Morningside Col.	
Greenleaf, W. J., U. S. Bureau Ed.	Spec. Higher Ed.		K. S.
Hart, C. A., Washington, D. C.	Dean of Freshmen	Catholic Univ.	P. M. K.
Heckel, A. K., Columbia, Mo.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Mo.	A. T. O.
Hodges, W. T., Williamsburg, Va.	Dean of Men	Wm. & Mary Col.	T. D. C.
Hoeing, Charles, Rochester, N. Y.	Dean of College	Univ. of Rochester	
Holleman, A. E., New Orleans, La.	Dir. of Stu. Act.	Tulane Univ.	
Hubbell, G. E., St. Louis, Mo.	Dean of Men	The Principia	
Johnston, J. R., Athens, Ohio	Dean of Men	Ohio Univ.	
Julian, J. H., Vermillion, S. D.	Dean of Stu. Aff's	Univ. of S. D.	
Kremers, Harry, Cedar Rapids, Ia.	Dean of Men	Coe Col.	P. K. T.
Lancaster, Dabney, University, Ala.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Ala.	D. T. D.
McConn, C. M., Bethlehem, Pa.	Dean of University	Lehigh	S. A. E.
McCourt, W. E., St. Louis, Mo.	Asst. Chancellor	Washington Univ.	
McElroy, C. H., Stillwater, Okla.	Dean of Men	Okla. A. & M.	S. N.
Mason, Kenneth O., Providence, R. I.	Dean of Freshmen	Brown Univ.	S. P. E.
Massey, F. M., Knoxville, Tenn.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Tenn.	P. K. A.
Melcher, C. R., Lexington, Ky.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Ky.	D. T. D.
Metzger, F. New Brunswick, N. J.	Dean of Men	Rutgers University	D. U.
Milner, C. A., Richmond, Ind.	Dean of Men	Earlham Col.	
Moore, V. I., Austin, Texas	Dean of Stu. Life	Univ. of Texas	K. S.
Park, J. A., Columbus, Ohio	Student Counselor	Ohio State Univ.	A. T. O.
Prather, E. O., Brookings, S. D.	Dean of Men	S. D. State Col.	
Randall, O. E., Providence, R. I.	Dean of University	Brown Univ.	P. U.
Rasmussen, P. A.	Dean of Men	Concordia College	
Richmond, J. L., Toledo, Ohio	Dean of Men	Univ. of Toledo	D. U.
Ripley, G. E., Fayetteville, Ark.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Ark.	
Rivenburg, R. H., Lewisburg, Pa.	Dean of Men	Bucknell Univ.	P. G. D.
Rollins, J. L., Evanston, Ill.	Asst. to Dean	Northwestern	P. D. T.
Ross, C. F., Meadeville, Pa.	Dean of Men & Reg.	Allegheny Col.	P. D. T.
Ryder, J. P., Philadelphia, Pa.	Dean of Men	Drexel Institute	
Sanders, W. L., Delaware, Ohio	Dean of Men	Ohio Wesleyan	S. C.
Sembower, C. J.	Dean of Men	Indiana Univ.	
Sarratt, C. M., Nashville, Tenn.	Dean or Students	Vanderbilt Univ.	S. N.
Smith, G. H., Urbana, Ill.	Asst. Dean, Fresh.	Univ. of Ill.	B. T. P.
Soule, Justus, Laramie, Wyo.	Dean of Men	Univ. Wyo.	
Stewart, J. A., Greenville, Pa.	Dean of Men	Thiel College	P. G. D.
Stone, H. E., Morgantown, W. Va.	Dean of Men	West Va. Uni.	P. G. D.
Tarbell, A. W., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Dean of Men	Carnegie Tech.	
Taylor, D. H., New York City	Coun. Stu. Per. Bur.	New York Univ.	S. C.
Thompson, J. J., Northfield, Minn.	Dean of Men	St. Olaf Col.	
Thompson, J. T., Lincoln, Nebr.	Dean of Stu. Aff's	Univ. of Nebr.	
Tilberg, W. E., Gettysburg, Pa.	Dean	Gettysburg Col.	
Trautman, W. D.	Dean	W. Re. Adelbert Col.	Z. P.
Vance, J. M., Wooster, Ohio	Dean of Men	Col. of Wooster	
Wahr, F. B., Ann Arbor, Mich.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Mich.	A. S. P.
Williams, V. M., Minneapolis, Minn.	General Secretary	Univ. of Minn.	S. N.
Wilkinson, C. J.	Ex. Sec. & Editor		P. G. D.
Woods, C. B., Washington, D. C.	Dean	American Univ.	S. N.
Worcester, P. G., Boulder, Colo.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Colo.	D. T. D.
Zumbrunnen, A. C., Dallas, Texas	Dean of Men	S. M. U.	

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OR PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Since so many of those now attending this Conference have recently joined, it has occurred to the secretary that a summary account of previous meetings might be of interest to many receiving these minutes.

The first meeting, held during the spring of 1919, was result of initiative of the "Big Ten" deans and attendance was small.

At the third meeting held in Iowa in 1921, there were sixteen in attendance and for the first time the secretary, Dean Goodnight, was instructed to print and distribute the minutes. From this and succeeding reports of minutes the following summaries are taken:

Meeting	Present	Place	President	Secretary†
3rd	16	Iowa	T. A. Clark	S. H. Goodnight
4th*	20	Kentucky	Nicholson	S. H. Goodnight
5th	17	Purdue	Coulter	Nicholson
6th**	29	Michigan	Bursley	Nicholson
7th	31	North Carolina	Reinow	Bradshaw
8th	46	Minnesota	Melcher	Bradshaw
9th	43	Georgia Tech.	Field	Bradshaw
10th	50	Boulder, Colo.	Goodnight	Dawson
11th	75	Washington, D. C. ..	Culver	Dawson

*No minutes were printed during Dean Goodnight's first year of service as Secretary.

**By mutual agreement Dean Bradshaw published the minutes of the North Carolina meeting instead of Dean Nicholson, the outgoing Secretary.

†To serve three years.

The following lists indicate the topics that have appeared on the minutes most prominently during the eight sessions:

THIRD MEETING

1. Student Government.
2. Fraternities.
3. Scholarship Reports.
4. Regulation of Social Life.
5. Student Health.
6. Absences.
7. Auditing accounts of Student Organizations.

FOURTH MEETING

1. Theta Nu Epsilon.
2. Helping the Freshman.
3. Price of Dance Orchestras.
4. Bad Checks.
5. History, Development and the Duties of the Office.

FIFTH MEETING

1. Personal Work of Dean.
2. Fraternity Discipline.
3. Limitation of Extra Curricular Activities.
4. Control of Accounts of Student Organizations.

5. Should a Student Choose His Course at the Beginning or Close of Freshman Year?
6. The Anti-Fraternity Campaign.
7. The Responsibility of the University for the Control of the Moral and Social Life of the Students.
8. Rooming House Problems.
9. Guidance Activities in American Colleges and Universities.

SIXTH MEETING

1. What are typical functions?
2. How can a dean come into closer personal contact with a large body of students?
3. Personnel work and vocational guidance.
4. How can students be stimulated to greater and more intelligent interest in problems of the day?
5. Relation of the General and Professional Fraternity to the University.
6. What should be ultimate aims:
 Scholarship requirements for pledging and initiation.
 Eligibility requirements for extra-curricula activities.
 Student Government, its character and extent.

SEVENTH MEETING

1. Fraternities.
2. Sophomore pledging.
3. Study of prevalence of the office of the Dean of Men, and its functions.
4. Extra-curricular activities.
5. Uniform method of reporting fraternity scholastic rank.
6. Student morality.
7. Dormitories.
8. Class scraps.
9. College spirit.
10. Rooming house inspection.
11. Bad checks.
12. Automobiles.

EIGHTH MEETING

1. Fraternity housing, pledging and scholarship.
2. Student government and welfare; sex, social, education, religious agencies.
3. Relationships of the dean's office.
4. Social life of unorganized students.
5. Freshman problems: freshman week, selection of students, college placement examinations.
6. Personnel Bureau and Dean's Office.
7. Procedure in Personnel work.
8. Liquor Problems.
9. Student Loans.
10. Maintaining personal contact in large institutions.

NINTH MEETING

1. The Unorganized Groups' Social Life.
2. Fraternities.
3. Student Government.
4. Automobiles.
5. The student who works to provide expenses.
6. Social customs and regulations.
7. Freshman orientation and guidance.
8. Discipline.
9. The Organization of College Personnel Work.

TENTH MEETING

1. Extra-curricular Activities.
2. Honor Courses.
3. The Function of the Dean of Men.
4. Vocational Guidance.
5. Freshman Week.
6. Fraternities.
7. Cases of Disturbed Mental Health.

ELEVENTH MEETING

1. Fraternities.
2. Housing of Students.
3. Financial Obligations of Students.
4. Personnel Record Cards.
5. Intercollegiate Athletics.
6. Student Loan Funds.
7. Cooperation with Student Groups.

APPENDIX C

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE DEANS OF MEN OF EASTERN COLLEGES AT THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, WASH- INGTON, D. C., APRIL 12, 1929

The Eastern Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, affiliated with the national association, was organized on April 12, 1929, by a number of deans in attendance at the national convention. It has decided to restrict membership to the territory east of the eastern border of Ohio. The three officers elected were authorized to make plans for the next meeting. The officers are: President, Henry Grattan Doyle, Dean of Men, The George Washington University, Washington, D. C.; vice-president, Harry E. Stone, Dean of Men, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia; secretary-treasurer, Kenneth O. Mason, Dean of Freshmen, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.